

Exhibit 2

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 1

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
3 COLUMBIA DIVISION

4 THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE
5 CONFERENCE OF THE NAACP

6 and

7 TAIWAN SCOTT, ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF
8 AND ALL OTHER SIMILARLY SITUATED
9 PERSONS,

10 Plaintiffs,

11 vs.

12 Case No. 3:21-CV-03302-JMC-TJH-RMG

13 THOMAS C. ALEXANDER, IN HIS OFFICIAL
14 CAPACITY AS PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE;
15 LUKE A. RANKIN, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY
16 AS CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY
17 COMMITTEE; MURRELL SMITH, IN HIS OFFICIAL
18 CAPACITY AS SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF
19 REPRESENTATIVES; CHRIS MURPHY, IN HIS
20 OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE
21 OF REPRESENTATIVES JUDICIARY COMMITTEE;
22 WALLACE H. JORDAN, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY
23 AS CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
24 ELECTIONS LAW SUBCOMMITTEE; HOWARD KNAPP,
25 IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS INTERIM
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA
STATE ELECTION COMMISSION; JOHN WELLS,
JOANNE DAY, CLIFFORD J. EDLER, LINDA MCCALL,
AND SCOTT MOSELEY, IN THEIR OFFICIAL
CAPACITIES AS MEMBERS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA
STATE ELECTION COMMISSION,

Defendants.

DEPOSITION OF: MOON DUCHIN, PHD
(Via Videoconference)

DATE: Tuesday, July 14, 2022

TIME: 10:13 a.m.

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 2</p> <p>1 LOCATION: Barnum Hall</p> <p>2 Packard Avenue</p> <p>3 Medford, Massachusetts</p> <p>4 TAKEN BY: Counsel for Thomas Alexander</p> <p>5 and Luke Rankin</p> <p>6 REPORTED BY: Elaine L. Grove-DeFreitas,</p> <p>7 Independent Professional Reporter</p> <p>8 (Via Videoconference)</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 4</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 ATTORNEYS FOR THE HOUSE DEFENDANTS:</p> <p>4 NEXSEN PRUET, LLC</p> <p>5 BY: ANDREW MATHIAS</p> <p>6 104 South Main Street</p> <p>7 Suite 900</p> <p>8 Greenville, South Carolina 29601</p> <p>9 864-370-2211</p> <p>10 AMathias@nexsenpruet.com</p> <p>11 (Via Videoconference)</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 ATTORNEYS FOR ELECTION DEFENDANTS:</p> <p>14 BURR & FORMAN, LLP</p> <p>15 BY: JANE W. TRINKLEY</p> <p>16 1221 Main Street</p> <p>17 Suite 1800</p> <p>18 Columbia, South Carolina 29201</p> <p>19 803-799-9800</p> <p>20 jtrinkley@burr.com</p> <p>21 (Via Videoconference)</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 ALSO PRESENT: Cyndi Nygord (via videoconference)</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 3</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 ATTORNEYS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS</p> <p>4 THE SOUTH CAROLINA STATE CONFERENCE OF</p> <p>5 THE NAACP AND MOON DUCHIN, PHD:</p> <p>6 NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE & EDUCATIONAL FUND,</p> <p>7 INC.</p> <p>8 BY: LEAH ADEN</p> <p>9 BY: JOHN CUSICK</p> <p>10 40 Rector Street</p> <p>11 Fifth Floor</p> <p>12 New York, New York 10006</p> <p>13 917-858-2870</p> <p>14 laden@naacpldf.org</p> <p>15 jcusick@naacpldf.org</p> <p>16 (Via Videoconference)</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 ATTORNEYS FOR THOMAS C. ALEXANDER AND</p> <p>19 LUKE A. RANKIN:</p> <p>20 JONES DAY</p> <p>21 BY: JOHN M. GORE</p> <p>22 51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.</p> <p>23 Washington, D.C. 20001</p> <p>24 202-879-3930</p> <p>25 jmgore@jonesday.com</p> <p>(Via Videoconference)</p> <p>ATTORNEYS FOR THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES</p> <p>UNION:</p> <p>AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION</p> <p>BY: ADRIEL I. CEPEDA DERIEUX</p> <p>125 Broad Street</p> <p>18th Floor</p> <p>New York, New York 10004</p> <p>212-549-2500</p> <p>ACepedaDerieux@aclu.org</p> <p>(Via Videoconference)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 I N D E X</p> <p>2 Page Line</p> <p>3 EXAMINATION</p> <p>4 BY MR. GORE..... 6/3</p> <p>5 BY MS. TRINKLEY..... 222/5</p> <p>6 BY MR. MATHIAS..... 222/23</p> <p>7 BY MS. ADEN..... 257/13</p> <p>8 BY MR. GORE..... 269/1</p> <p>9 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER..... 270</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 E X H I B I T S</p> <p>12 Page Line</p> <p>13 EXHIBIT 1, Senate Defendants' Notice Of Taking</p> <p>14 Videoconference Deposition Of Dr. Moon Duchin.. 10/25</p> <p>15</p> <p>16 EXHIBIT 2, April 11, 2022 Report on South</p> <p>17 Carolina Congressional Districts..... 26/14</p> <p>18 EXHIBIT 3, 2021 Guidelines and Criteria for</p> <p>19 Congressional and Legislative Redistricting.... 41/23</p> <p>20</p> <p>21 EXHIBIT 4, 2021 Redistricting Guidelines..... 49/19</p> <p>22</p> <p>23 EXHIBIT 5, No Exhibit Introduced..... --</p> <p>24</p> <p>25 EXHIBIT 6, Curriculum Vitae of Moon Duchin, PhD 195/24</p> <p>EXHIBIT 7, Expert Report of Sean P. Trende..... 196/16</p> <p>EXHIBIT 8, May 4, 2022 Response to the Expert</p> <p>Report of Sean P. Trende dated April 18, 2022.. 197/17</p>

2 (Pages 2 - 5)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 MOON DUCHIN, PHD, 2 being first duly sworn, testified as follows: 3 DIRECT EXAMINATION 4 BY MR. GORE: 5 Q. Good morning, Dr. Duchin. My name is 6 John Gore. I'm with the Law Firm of Jones Day. I 7 represent the Senate Defendants, Thomas Alexander 8 and Luke Rankin in connection with the redistricting 9 challenge that has been brought in the United States 10 District Court for the District of South Carolina. 11 And you understand that you're appearing in 12 connection with that case today. Correct? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. And will you say and spell your first 15 and last names for the record, please? 16 A. Sure. It's Moon Duchin. That's 17 M-O-O-N, D-U-C-H-I-N. 18 Q. And you understand that you're under 19 oath and have an obligation to tell the truth today. 20 Correct? 21 A. I do. 22 Q. We have a court reporter here to take 23 down your testimony. The court reporter does need 24 verbal answers, so please give a verbal answer to 25 each question, a yes or a no. The court reporter</p>	<p>1 answer the question before we go to the break. Is 2 that fair? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. Okay. Thank you. So Dr. Duchin, where 5 are you today? 6 A. I'm at Tufts University in 7 Massachusetts. 8 Q. And is anyone in the room with you? 9 A. No. 10 Q. And do you have any papers with you 11 where you are? 12 A. I do not. 13 Q. What did you do to prepare for today's 14 deposition? 15 A. I did two preparation sessions with 16 counsel in which we reviewed the materials and 17 discussed some likely questions. 18 Q. And when did the first of those two 19 sessions take place? 20 A. Late last week. I believe it was 21 Friday. 22 Q. And how long did it last? 23 A. One to two hours. 24 Q. Who was present? 25 A. Leah Aden and John Cusick, both of whom</p>
Page 7	Page 9
<p>1 cannot record a nod or a headshake. Does that sound 2 fair? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And you're being defended in this 5 deposition today by Ms. Aden, I believe. Is that 6 right? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. And Ms. Aden may object to a question 9 that I pose, such as an objection to form or 10 something like that. Unless you're instructed not 11 to answer, you can go ahead and answer my question. 12 Does that make sense? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. And the most important rule here today 15 is if you don't understand a question, will you ask 16 me to clarify the question? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. And if you do answer a question, I will 19 assume that you understood it. Is that fair? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Also, this is not a marathon. It may 22 feel a little bit like a slog at times, but if you 23 need to take a break for any reason, at any time 24 just let me know and we can do that. The only thing 25 that I ask is that if a question is pending, you</p>	<p>1 are on the call today, and myself. 2 Q. And when did the second preparation 3 session take place? 4 A. Tuesday, the day before yesterday. 5 Q. And how long did that last? 6 A. I would estimate that was about an hour. 7 Q. Who was present? 8 A. The same people. 9 Q. And did you review any documents in 10 preparation for today's deposition? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. And which documents did you review? 13 A. We reviewed my two reports that I 14 believe are dated April 11th and May 4th. We may 15 have briefly reviewed the House and the Senate 16 Guidelines on redistricting. That is all that I 17 recall. 18 Q. Do you know why you were retained to 19 provide a report in this case? 20 A. Yes. I discussed the assignment with in 21 my first report, but -- so can we pull that up? 22 Q. We can. Just one second. Let me ask 23 you a question, first, if that's okay. 24 A. Sure. 25 Q. Do you recall who first contacted you</p>

3 (Pages 6 - 9)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 10	<p>1 about doing a report in this case?</p> <p>2 A. As I recall, it was Leah Aden.</p> <p>3 Q. And when did that take place?</p> <p>4 A. That, I'm not sure. It feels like a</p> <p>5 very long time ago because this has been along</p> <p>6 redistricting season. But as you know, I also</p> <p>7 provided reports in the State House redistricting</p> <p>8 matter and so I may have been retained as much as</p> <p>9 six months ago or more. I can look up the date, but</p> <p>10 I'm not sure, as I speak.</p> <p>11 Q. And other than these two matters in</p> <p>12 South Carolina have you previously been retained by</p> <p>13 Ms. Aden or the NAACP Legal Defense Fund?</p> <p>14 A. Yes. Not working with Ms. Aden, but I</p> <p>15 did work with LDF in Alabama. I am still working</p> <p>16 for LDF in Alabama.</p> <p>17 Q. How about the ACLU?</p> <p>18 A. I have not been retained by the ACLU.</p> <p>19 Q. What about the Law Firm of Arnold &</p> <p>20 Porter?</p> <p>21 A. No. That is no, I have not been</p> <p>22 retained by Arnold & Porter.</p> <p>23 Q. Got you. So we can go ahead and</p> <p>24 introduce this exhibit as Exhibit 1.</p> <p>25 (Exhibit No. 1, Senate Defendants' Notice Of Taking</p>	Page 12	<p>1 representatives in connection with this case.</p> <p>2 Prior to today's deposition did you do</p> <p>3 anything to collect documents that would fall into</p> <p>4 that category?</p> <p>5 A. Yes. I made an attempt to review all of</p> <p>6 my communications with counsel to see what materials</p> <p>7 had been provided.</p> <p>8 Q. And letter J asks for copies of any</p> <p>9 communications exchanged by and between you and</p> <p>10 plaintiff's counsel in connection with this matter.</p> <p>11 Did you do anything to review and collect those</p> <p>12 documents?</p> <p>13 A. I did review those documents. And I</p> <p>14 believe they were provided by counsel. Certainly,</p> <p>15 not directly by me.</p> <p>16 Q. And did plaintiff's counsel in this case</p> <p>17 provide you any facts to use in your -- in preparing</p> <p>18 your reports?</p> <p>19 A. That is -- let me just try and clarify</p> <p>20 the question. When you say provide me facts, do you</p> <p>21 mean represent to me that things were true?</p> <p>22 Q. Represent to you that things were true</p> <p>23 or provide to you any analysis, data, assumptions or</p> <p>24 facts related to this matter.</p> <p>25 A. So then, okay, that includes data. Yes.</p>
Page 11	<p>1 Videoconference Deposition Of Dr. Moon Duchin, was</p> <p>2 marked)</p> <p>3 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>4 Q. And can you see anything on your screen?</p> <p>5 A. No. Should I be looking in Exhibit</p> <p>6 Share?</p> <p>7 Q. You can or I can do a quick screen share</p> <p>8 here. How about that? Can you see that?</p> <p>9 A. I see the screen share, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And this is the notice of your</p> <p>11 deposition which was issued for your deposition</p> <p>12 today. Have you seen this document before?</p> <p>13 A. I attempted to review everything that</p> <p>14 was in the folder of materials that was provided, so</p> <p>15 I suspect that I at least looked at this.</p> <p>16 Q. And as part of this document we asked</p> <p>17 you to produce documents related to your opinion in</p> <p>18 this case. And that's part of the subpoena here all</p> <p>19 the way at the end of this, Exhibit A. Have you</p> <p>20 reviewed this, to your memory?</p> <p>21 A. I have looked through it.</p> <p>22 Q. I'm going to ask you about a couple of</p> <p>23 these things. Letter G asks for copies of all</p> <p>24 materials provided to you by plaintiff's counsel or</p> <p>25 plaintiffs or their officers, employees or</p>	Page 13	<p>1 I was provided with an electoral data set for South</p> <p>2 Carolina. That was many months ago, before --</p> <p>3 before the work had started on the congressional</p> <p>4 district, specifically.</p> <p>5 Another matter that we discussed was the</p> <p>6 timeline of when various demonstrative maps had been</p> <p>7 introduced. Other than that -- those are the main</p> <p>8 things that occur to me as facts or data that were</p> <p>9 provided by counsel, as opposed to being part of</p> <p>10 widely available public record.</p> <p>11 Q. Did counsel provide you any of the other</p> <p>12 expert reports in this case?</p> <p>13 A. I have seen expert reports from Sean</p> <p>14 Trende. I have not seen other plaintiff's expert</p> <p>15 reports.</p> <p>16 Q. And after you collected the documents in</p> <p>17 response to the subpoena, what did you do with them?</p> <p>18 A. Let me see. I discussed with counsel</p> <p>19 which documents I thought were responsive to the</p> <p>20 subpoena, and then my understanding is that they</p> <p>21 handed over to you a packet of documents and</p> <p>22 communications.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And did you provide to counsel</p> <p>24 all documents that were responsive to the subpoena?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, to the best of my ability.</p>

4 (Pages 10 - 13)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

Page 14	Page 16
<p>1 Q. Thank you. I would like to ask you a</p> <p>2 few more questions about your background. Can you</p> <p>3 please describe for us your educational background</p> <p>4 after high school?</p> <p>5 A. Sure. I was an undergraduate at Harvard</p> <p>6 University and formally graduated in 1998 with</p> <p>7 degrees in Mathematics and Women Studies.</p> <p>8 I matriculated in 1998 at the University</p> <p>9 of Chicago where I did my graduate work. I have</p> <p>10 Master's degree in Mathematics and a PhD in Math</p> <p>11 from Chicago from 2005. So that's my educational</p> <p>12 background. After that I would characterize it as</p> <p>13 professional work.</p> <p>14 Q. And was legislative redistricting part</p> <p>15 of your studies during your educational background,</p> <p>16 during your university studies and graduate work?</p> <p>17 A. No, I did not study redistricting as an</p> <p>18 undergrad or graduate student.</p> <p>19 Q. And can you tell me your professional</p> <p>20 experience and background since you finished your</p> <p>21 graduate studies?</p> <p>22 A. Sure. I will be brief. Tell me if you</p> <p>23 want more detail. After graduating from East</p> <p>24 Chicago I held post-doctoral positions at the</p> <p>25 University of California Davis and University of</p>	<p>1 redistricting start in 2016 or at some other time?</p> <p>2 A. That's right, in 2016.</p> <p>3 Q. And have you written any peer-reviewed</p> <p>4 publications about redistricting?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, quite a few. Probably -- we can</p> <p>6 look at my CV and count, but at least ten.</p> <p>7 Q. And are those all listed in our CV?</p> <p>8 A. Yes. My CV is as current as I can make</p> <p>9 it.</p> <p>10 Q. Thank you. Have you written any</p> <p>11 peer-reviewed publications about South Carolina?</p> <p>12 A. South Carolina has been mentioned in my</p> <p>13 peer-reviewed publications, but there were none that</p> <p>14 focused on South Carolina exclusively.</p> <p>15 Q. Have you submitted any works for peer</p> <p>16 review that were then rejected and not published?</p> <p>17 A. Oh. And never published? Or do you</p> <p>18 mean has a journal ever declined to publish my work?</p> <p>19 Q. Has a journal ever declined to publish</p> <p>20 your work?</p> <p>21 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>22 Q. How many times has that happened?</p> <p>23 A. Oh, I don't know. But it's quite</p> <p>24 frequent to have one or more rejections before a</p> <p>25 paper is placed. I wouldn't be able to count, off</p>
Page 15	Page 17
<p>1 Michigan, along with visits to the Mathematical</p> <p>2 Sciences Research Institute and a few others.</p> <p>3 In 2011 I started my tenure track</p> <p>4 position at Tufts University, and after a few</p> <p>5 promotions I am now a full professor at Tufts in</p> <p>6 mathematics with several affiliate appointments.</p> <p>7 And I'm a senior fellow in the College of Civic Life</p> <p>8 at Tufts, which is called Tisch College at Tufts.</p> <p>9 Q. And since obtaining your PhD what areas</p> <p>10 of research and scholarship have you concentrated</p> <p>11 on?</p> <p>12 A. Well, in pure mathematics my specialties</p> <p>13 are load dimensional geometric topology. Apologies</p> <p>14 in advance to the court reporter for having to</p> <p>15 decode that.</p> <p>16 I studied dynamical systems and discreet</p> <p>17 geometry and group theory.</p> <p>18 I also work in the area called Science</p> <p>19 Technology and Society and directed the program in</p> <p>20 that area here, at Tufts, for five to six years.</p> <p>21 Since 2016 I have had an intense</p> <p>22 research focus in areas connected to voting,</p> <p>23 especially social choice theory and redistricting.</p> <p>24 Q. And so did your interest in</p> <p>25 redistricting -- your scholarship interest in</p>	<p>1 the top of my head.</p> <p>2 Q. And how many articles have you submitted</p> <p>3 that were never published by any journal?</p> <p>4 A. I cannot think of any articles that were</p> <p>5 never either published in their original form or in</p> <p>6 a revised form. I have a few that are still in</p> <p>7 submission and so I can't say for sure where they</p> <p>8 will land, but I can't -- nothing comes to mind that</p> <p>9 was rejected and never revived.</p> <p>10 Q. And do your articles that are still in</p> <p>11 submission address legislative redistricting at all?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, several do.</p> <p>13 Q. In how many cases have you been an</p> <p>14 expert witness?</p> <p>15 A. There is a list on the CV. And so to be</p> <p>16 fully accurate, I would be happy to pull that up.</p> <p>17 But I can tell you that I have written reports</p> <p>18 and/or provided testimony or deposition recently, in</p> <p>19 the last year, in North Carolina, Pennsylvania,</p> <p>20 Wisconsin, Alabama, South Carolina and Texas.</p> <p>21 Q. And how many of those cases were</p> <p>22 redistricting cases?</p> <p>23 A. All of them.</p> <p>24 Q. And have you testified in court in any</p> <p>25 of those cases?</p>

5 (Pages 14 - 17)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 18	<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Which ones?</p> <p>3 A. I testified in federal district court in</p> <p>4 the Alabama case. I testified in state court in</p> <p>5 North Carolina and in Pennsylvania. I believe</p> <p>6 that's it so far.</p> <p>7 Q. So you have not testified in court in</p> <p>8 Texas?</p> <p>9 A. Not yet.</p> <p>10 Q. How about Wisconsin?</p> <p>11 A. No. There ended up being no expert</p> <p>12 testimony in Wisconsin.</p> <p>13 Q. Can you briefly describe to me what your</p> <p>14 specific area of expertise is when it comes to</p> <p>15 redistricting?</p> <p>16 A. I will try, although I think my</p> <p>17 redistricting interests are quite broad. But I</p> <p>18 think my particular expertise is in computational</p> <p>19 methods, on one hand. And on the other hand, the</p> <p>20 area that I called STS earlier, which also looks at</p> <p>21 historical and social aspects of voting rights and</p> <p>22 redistricting.</p> <p>23 Q. Has any court ever excluded your expert</p> <p>24 testimony?</p> <p>25 A. No.</p>	Page 20	<p>1 those examples of when that has happened?</p> <p>2 A. Sure. One example is in Alabama where I</p> <p>3 drew four demonstrative maps that were called: Plan</p> <p>4 A, B, C and D that were entered as Gingles 1</p> <p>5 Demonstration Plans.</p> <p>6 In numerous of the cases we have</p> <p>7 discussed I have drawn alternative demonstrative</p> <p>8 maps that have played various roles in the</p> <p>9 litigation. I can give more examples if that is of</p> <p>10 interest.</p> <p>11 I have also played a role sometimes in</p> <p>12 assisting various land-drawing bodies outside of the</p> <p>13 litigation context. For example, I provided data</p> <p>14 support to the so-called People's Maps Commission in</p> <p>15 Wisconsin which was a commission convened, I</p> <p>16 believe, by gubernatorial executive order. And as</p> <p>17 part of that role I provided the Commission with</p> <p>18 dozens of demonstrative maps to consider and review.</p> <p>19 Those are examples. If you would like</p> <p>20 more examples of that kind, I can try to drill</p> <p>21 deeper into the various ways that I have drawn maps,</p> <p>22 but suffice it to say it's something I do</p> <p>23 frequently.</p> <p>24 Q. I want to ask you a little bit about</p> <p>25 this Alabama case where you did the four -- I think</p>
Page 19	<p>1 Q. And do you know if any of the cases in</p> <p>2 which you testified your testimony was criticized by</p> <p>3 a court?</p> <p>4 A. Can you be more precise about what</p> <p>5 criticized might mean?</p> <p>6 Q. Has there ever been a case where a court</p> <p>7 has not accepted your testimony in its ruling?</p> <p>8 A. Not in entirety. As I recall, in the</p> <p>9 Pennsylvania case the -- let's see if I can get this</p> <p>10 right. Before the case was taken up but the State</p> <p>11 Supreme Court there was testimony heard by a single</p> <p>12 judge who then became a special master. And in her</p> <p>13 report as a special master, I believe she accepted</p> <p>14 three dozen points of my testimony and cast doubt on</p> <p>15 two. Those numbers should be taken as approximate.</p> <p>16 Q. Thank you. Are you a map drawer?</p> <p>17 A. I have, at times, drawn maps for various</p> <p>18 land drawing bodies and sometimes in litigation.</p> <p>19 Q. Have you ever been qualified as an</p> <p>20 expert in map drawing?</p> <p>21 A. I believe in Alabama I was qualified as</p> <p>22 an expert in demography and possibly cartography,</p> <p>23 but I would have to check the records to be sure.</p> <p>24 Q. You mentioned that you, at various</p> <p>25 times, had drawn maps. Can you walk me through</p>	Page 21	<p>1 you said you did four demonstrative maps, A, B, C</p> <p>2 and D on a Gingles 1 analysis?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. So in those maps you were drawing</p> <p>5 majority-minority districts. Is that correct?</p> <p>6 A. Well, yes. Let me qualify that by</p> <p>7 saying that part of the question was how to count</p> <p>8 which group was at issue, and so I provided</p> <p>9 demographic analysis for those reports with various</p> <p>10 bases of population. But it is true that all four</p> <p>11 of those plans were -- had two districts in which</p> <p>12 there was a majority of so-called Any Part Black</p> <p>13 Voting Age Population. Is that responsive to your</p> <p>14 question?</p> <p>15 Q. Yes, it is, thank you. And did the</p> <p>16 Court in Alabama review or analyze your proposed</p> <p>17 maps?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, they did.</p> <p>19 Q. And what did the court say, if anything,</p> <p>20 about those maps?</p> <p>21 A. So the court generally was extremely --</p> <p>22 found my testimony to be extremely persuasive and</p> <p>23 credible. And the maps were part of that testimony.</p> <p>24 If you are asking for specific comments</p> <p>25 evaluating the maps, I would -- I would need to have</p>

6 (Pages 18 - 21)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 the document -- the decision pulled up so that we</p> <p>2 could review them, because I wouldn't want to try to</p> <p>3 paraphrase without them.</p> <p>4 Q. Thank you. I appreciate that. I'm just</p> <p>5 trying to get a general sense right now.</p> <p>6 Did the court adopt any of your maps as</p> <p>7 a remedy in that case?</p> <p>8 A. They did not. They, instead, asked for</p> <p>9 the state to -- and here I will try to paraphrase --</p> <p>10 draw either a second district that is majority Black</p> <p>11 or something very much like it. I believe their</p> <p>12 wording was something in that direction, indicating</p> <p>13 that the second remedial district need not be</p> <p>14 majority Black.</p> <p>15 Q. And was this part of Alabama litigation</p> <p>16 that was stayed by the U.S. Supreme Court?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, indeed.</p> <p>18 Q. Now, you mentioned numerous other cases</p> <p>19 in which you have drawn maps for various purposes.</p> <p>20 Is that right?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And in any of those cases were the maps</p> <p>23 you drew submitted to the court?</p> <p>24 A. You mean as exhibits?</p> <p>25 Q. As exhibits or as evidence in the case.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 districting principles, looked at racial fairness</p> <p>2 frameworks. So it was a fairly extensive piece of</p> <p>3 work.</p> <p>4 Q. And is the North Carolina Congressional</p> <p>5 case the case in which the U.S. Supreme Court</p> <p>6 recently granted certiorari? If you know.</p> <p>7 A. Yes, that is correct. To my</p> <p>8 understanding. I should always qualify that I am</p> <p>9 not aware.</p> <p>10 Q. And you're much better off for it, I'm</p> <p>11 sure.</p> <p>12 How about the Pennsylvania case? What</p> <p>13 was the general topic or subject of your testimony</p> <p>14 in that case?</p> <p>15 A. Again, that focused on partisan fairness</p> <p>16 but did also look at minority opportunity to elect,</p> <p>17 as did North Carolina, and traditional districting</p> <p>18 principles.</p> <p>19 I will mention that in both Pennsylvania</p> <p>20 and North Carolina I provided analysis connected to</p> <p>21 a demonstrative map that I did not draw myself. My</p> <p>22 role was to evaluate rather than draw in those</p> <p>23 states.</p> <p>24 Q. And who drew the maps that you</p> <p>25 evaluated?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 A. I'm thinking back through. I am not</p> <p>2 sure. I would like to give a technically correct</p> <p>3 answer, and I'm just not sure if they were submitted</p> <p>4 as exhibits.</p> <p>5 Q. And then you mentioned the People's Maps</p> <p>6 Commission in Wisconsin. Do I have that right, that</p> <p>7 name correct?</p> <p>8 A. PMC. That is correct.</p> <p>9 Q. PMC. Terrific. And I think you said</p> <p>10 you provided data support. Did you also draw maps</p> <p>11 for the PMC?</p> <p>12 A. As I mentioned, I gave them dozens of</p> <p>13 demonstrative maps to consider. Not to adopt, but</p> <p>14 to consider in terms of weighing alternative options</p> <p>15 for drawing.</p> <p>16 Q. And what was the subject of your</p> <p>17 testimony in the North Carolina case?</p> <p>18 A. In the North Carolina case all three</p> <p>19 levels of redistricting plan were being challenged,</p> <p>20 the Congressional, State Senate and State House</p> <p>21 districts. And my role was, in large part, to</p> <p>22 examine partisan fairness considerations at all</p> <p>23 three levels. But my report -- my reports, I</p> <p>24 believe there may have been as many as five in that</p> <p>25 case, went well beyond that, looked at traditional</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 A. In Pennsylvania the map was drawn by the</p> <p>2 governor's office, although to this day I do not</p> <p>3 know the identities of the people who actually sat</p> <p>4 at the computer to draw it.</p> <p>5 In North Carolina I did not know who</p> <p>6 drew the map when I evaluated it, but it came out in</p> <p>7 the course of the trial that it had been drawn by a</p> <p>8 team that included both attorneys and data</p> <p>9 scientists.</p> <p>10 Q. What was the Wisconsin case about?</p> <p>11 A. In Wisconsin, like in North Carolina,</p> <p>12 there was a challenge to the Congressional districts</p> <p>13 as well as the State Senate and Assembly districts.</p> <p>14 The issues that were important in that case were</p> <p>15 issues of -- well, the State Supreme Court in</p> <p>16 Wisconsin centered a principle of least change. So</p> <p>17 that was a very important issue at the heart of that</p> <p>18 have case, thinking about what least change might</p> <p>19 mean and how to measure it. But issues of partisan</p> <p>20 fairness and also of minority opportunity to elect</p> <p>21 were also important.</p> <p>22 Q. If you know, was that an impasse case or</p> <p>23 a partisan gerrymandering case?</p> <p>24 A. I do not know. To clarify, by "impasse"</p> <p>25 you mean that the split control meant that no map</p>

7 (Pages 22 - 25)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 had been enacted and approved?</p> <p>2 Q. That's right.</p> <p>3 A. I wouldn't want to try to guess how to</p> <p>4 classify the case correctly in legal terms.</p> <p>5 Q. And you have never been an expert in a</p> <p>6 nonredistricting case. Is that right?</p> <p>7 A. That's correct.</p> <p>8 Q. If I have done this correctly, you</p> <p>9 should be able to see your report on the screen.</p> <p>10 Can you see your report?</p> <p>11 A. I can. And I also have a local copy.</p> <p>12 Q. Great. And I have marked this as</p> <p>13 Exhibit 2.</p> <p>14 (Exhibit No. 2, April 11, 2022 Report on South</p> <p>15 Carolina Congressional Districts, was marked)</p> <p>16 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>17 Q. Is this a report you prepared in this</p> <p>18 case?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. How many reports have you prepared in</p> <p>21 the case?</p> <p>22 A. For Congressional districts there were</p> <p>23 two, dated April 11th and May 4th.</p> <p>24 Q. How much time did you spend preparing</p> <p>25 this report, this April 11th report?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 supervision. The analysis was done by me.</p> <p>2 Q. And I believe your report says that</p> <p>3 you --</p> <p>4 A. Actually --</p> <p>5 Q. -- are being paid -- sorry. Go ahead.</p> <p>6 A. Can I add to that?</p> <p>7 Q. Please.</p> <p>8 A. The other element of research support</p> <p>9 that I received was assistance reviewing the public</p> <p>10 hearing testimony, just to be complete in my answer.</p> <p>11 Q. I see. So can you give me little bit</p> <p>12 more information about what that review of the</p> <p>13 public testimony entailed?</p> <p>14 A. I personally read all of the public</p> <p>15 testimony that was presented by the State in written</p> <p>16 form on the State's website. There was a great deal</p> <p>17 of it, many, many pages. And in order to attempt a</p> <p>18 more comprehensive review I also had a research</p> <p>19 assistant review the same corpus and we discussed it</p> <p>20 together.</p> <p>21 Q. And did your research assistant prepare</p> <p>22 any summaries or excerpts from the testimony?</p> <p>23 A. We, I would say, worked together to flag</p> <p>24 aspects that seemed relevant.</p> <p>25 Q. So you don't recall one way or the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 A. I couldn't say, but many hours.</p> <p>2 Q. Do you recall how many drafts of this</p> <p>3 report you went through?</p> <p>4 A. I have what I would call a continuous</p> <p>5 editing process, so I don't think about the process</p> <p>6 in terms of discreet drafts. But, you know, I</p> <p>7 worked on this over the course of weeks.</p> <p>8 Q. Did you get any assistance in preparing</p> <p>9 this report?</p> <p>10 A. I do have research assistants working</p> <p>11 under my supervision.</p> <p>12 Q. How many of them worked on this report?</p> <p>13 A. None of them worked on the writing of</p> <p>14 this report, if that's what you mean.</p> <p>15 Q. What about the analysis behind this</p> <p>16 report or any of the data support behind this</p> <p>17 report?</p> <p>18 A. Right. I would say two research</p> <p>19 assistants provided support.</p> <p>20 Q. And what was the nature of that support?</p> <p>21 A. Data curation, as I call it. So</p> <p>22 creating a data product that works with our general</p> <p>23 software and techniques and writing code and running</p> <p>24 analysis -- well, I shouldn't say running analysis.</p> <p>25 I should say running computational scripts under my</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 other, or your research assistant did not prepare</p> <p>2 any summaries or excerpts or copy and pastes for any</p> <p>3 of those -- any of those bodies of testimony?</p> <p>4 A. I would say the copy and paste was done</p> <p>5 by me.</p> <p>6 Q. And I believe you said that in your</p> <p>7 report that you're being compensated at \$300 an</p> <p>8 hour. Is that right?</p> <p>9 A. We can pull that up, but that sounds</p> <p>10 right.</p> <p>11 Q. Sure. I'll see if I can find it. Right</p> <p>12 here?</p> <p>13 A. Yes. There we are.</p> <p>14 Q. Do you know how much -- approximately</p> <p>15 how much you have been paid to date for your work in</p> <p>16 this matter?</p> <p>17 A. I don't, but I am aware that the</p> <p>18 invoices were turned over to you in the last few</p> <p>19 weeks. I think it's the case -- I'm confident that</p> <p>20 the invoices don't separate the South Carolina House</p> <p>21 District work from the South Carolina Congressional</p> <p>22 District work. So it's hard for me to identify</p> <p>23 specifically how many hours and how much</p> <p>24 compensation attached to Congressional districts.</p> <p>25 Q. So your billing in this matter has been</p>

8 (Pages 26 - 29)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

Page 30	Page 32
<p>1 for South Carolina, generally, though, than for</p> <p>2 either aspect of the case.</p> <p>3 A. That's right.</p> <p>4 Q. Is that fair?</p> <p>5 A. That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q. So section 1.2 of your report identifies</p> <p>7 certain materials that you relied on. You have the</p> <p>8 Census data, including other products from the</p> <p>9 Census Bureau, like the ACS. You looked at the</p> <p>10 House of Representatives and Senate Guidelines;</p> <p>11 also, at the Congressional plan and publicly</p> <p>12 submitted alternative plans and</p> <p>13 community-of-interest testimony. Were there any</p> <p>14 other materials that you relied on or used in</p> <p>15 preparing this report?</p> <p>16 A. Yes. I would say that in the review to</p> <p>17 turn over materials I realized that I had</p> <p>18 inadvertently omitted electoral data from this list.</p> <p>19 And as I mentioned, electoral data was provided to</p> <p>20 me by counsel many months ago.</p> <p>21 Q. And can you recall what that electoral</p> <p>22 data was in more detail?</p> <p>23 A. Yes. It was a shapefile of precincts</p> <p>24 with election results joined.</p> <p>25 Q. Do you recall which election results?</p>	<p>1 conclusion. And I would say that I try to carefully</p> <p>2 scope my role as one that provides evidence. So I</p> <p>3 do think that I provide evidence that might be</p> <p>4 helpful for reaching a conclusion like that. But</p> <p>5 that is my sense of my role here, is quantitative</p> <p>6 analysis and evidence.</p> <p>7 Q. Will you be offering an opinion at trial</p> <p>8 as to whether or not the enacted plan intentionally</p> <p>9 discriminates on the basis of race?</p> <p>10 A. I find -- I think I would try very</p> <p>11 studiously to construct my response as saying that I</p> <p>12 find evidence that supports that conclusion.</p> <p>13 Q. But will you offer the ultimate opinion</p> <p>14 one way or the other whether the enacted plan</p> <p>15 intentionally discriminates?</p> <p>16 A. That sounds, to me, like a bit further</p> <p>17 than I like to go.</p> <p>18 Q. Is that a no, then, the answer to my</p> <p>19 question?</p> <p>20 A. Well, you're asking about a future</p> <p>21 statement and so I cannot conclusively describe all</p> <p>22 possible future statements, but I can describe my</p> <p>23 sense of my role and my plans for how I will express</p> <p>24 them.</p> <p>25 Q. And as you sit here today, do you hold</p>
Page 31	Page 33
<p>1 A. I do not. But I only used the statewide</p> <p>2 elections that are referenced in my May 4th report.</p> <p>3 Q. And other than Mr. Trende's reports</p> <p>4 which you reviewed, I believe you said you have not</p> <p>5 reviewed any other expert reports in the case. Is</p> <p>6 that right?</p> <p>7 A. That is right. To be clear, I spent a</p> <p>8 substantial amount of time reviewing Sean Trende's</p> <p>9 initial report but had missed the rebuttal report.</p> <p>10 So I have now reviewed it but have not spent a long</p> <p>11 time with the rebuttal report.</p> <p>12 Q. Thank you. And both your initial report</p> <p>13 and your rebuttal report offer testimony on the</p> <p>14 South Carolina Congressional Map enacted earlier</p> <p>15 this year. Correct?</p> <p>16 A. Well, I'm not sure it's testimony, per</p> <p>17 se, but they offer analysis.</p> <p>18 Q. Analysis. Okay. Great. And I'm going</p> <p>19 to refer to that plan as the "enacted plan." Is</p> <p>20 that okay?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. Thank you. Do either of your reports</p> <p>23 conclude that the enacted plan intentionally</p> <p>24 discriminates on the basis of race?</p> <p>25 A. That sounds, to me, like a legal</p>	<p>1 the opinion that the enacted plan intentionally</p> <p>2 discriminates on the basis of race?</p> <p>3 A. I hold the opinion that there is</p> <p>4 compelling evidence to support that conclusion.</p> <p>5 Q. And do either of your reports conclude</p> <p>6 that race predominated over traditional district</p> <p>7 principles in the enacted plan?</p> <p>8 A. Let me stipulate that -- so that I don't</p> <p>9 speak very repetitively, that we can maybe shorthand</p> <p>10 the phrase "evidence in support of," but let me just</p> <p>11 stipulate that I always intend to provide evidence</p> <p>12 in support of various legal conclusions and not to</p> <p>13 provide legal conclusions myself. Having said that,</p> <p>14 I do offer evidence of the predominance of racial</p> <p>15 concerns over various kinds of other principles.</p> <p>16 Q. And as you sit here today do you hold an</p> <p>17 opinion that race predominated over the -- over</p> <p>18 traditional districting criteria in the enacted</p> <p>19 plan?</p> <p>20 A. Let's say I do hold the opinion that</p> <p>21 other principles were subordinated to concerns that</p> <p>22 are -- that involve race.</p> <p>23 Q. And what are those concerns that involve</p> <p>24 race?</p> <p>25 A. If we could look at my report, we can</p>

9 (Pages 30 - 33)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 look at section 7 on page 25 of my initial report.</p> <p>2 So in this section I look at what I call:</p> <p>3 "Electoral opportunity for Black voters." And I do</p> <p>4 think that there is evidence that electoral</p> <p>5 opportunity for Black voters has been a concern in</p> <p>6 the creation of the map. And, in particular, I</p> <p>7 offer evidence that it predominates over other</p> <p>8 partisan considerations.</p> <p>9 Q. Are there any other concerns that</p> <p>10 involve race that you believe predominate over</p> <p>11 traditional districting criteria?</p> <p>12 A. Could I ask you to rephrase the</p> <p>13 question?</p> <p>14 Q. Sure. I think what you said a couple</p> <p>15 answers ago was that you believe that concerns that</p> <p>16 involve race predominated over traditional criteria,</p> <p>17 and I asked you what those are.</p> <p>18 You said electoral opportunity for Black</p> <p>19 voters. I'm just curious if there are any other</p> <p>20 concerns or issues that touch on race or involve</p> <p>21 race, to use your phrase, that are addressed in your</p> <p>22 report or form part of your opinions.</p> <p>23 It's not meant to be a trick question.</p> <p>24 I'm just trying to understand what you meant by</p> <p>25 concerns that involve race.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 visualization that is shaded and where the intensity</p> <p>2 of the shading reflects some numerical quantity.</p> <p>3 And that's what we see here.</p> <p>4 Q. And what is being depicted in Figure 1?</p> <p>5 A. This is the share of Black voting age</p> <p>6 population in every VTD. Those are often informally</p> <p>7 called precincts, so in every precinct in South</p> <p>8 Carolina.</p> <p>9 Q. And which data did you use to determine</p> <p>10 the BVAP in precincts for Figure 1?</p> <p>11 A. This is decennial census data from the</p> <p>12 PL94-171.</p> <p>13 Q. And on page 6 you have -- are these also</p> <p>14 choropleths?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, it's fair to call these</p> <p>16 choropleths.</p> <p>17 Q. Figure 2. And here is this depicting</p> <p>18 changes in BVAP by county over a period of time? Is</p> <p>19 that right?</p> <p>20 A. That's correct.</p> <p>21 Q. And that's according to the American</p> <p>22 Community Survey estimates. Is that right?</p> <p>23 A. Yes. So this is, on top, by county; on</p> <p>24 the bottom, by tract. This is showing the change</p> <p>25 between the ACS estimates of 2010 and 2019.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 A. Sure. I understand. I think we could</p> <p>2 look at my response report of May 4th on page 2 and</p> <p>3 look at the first bullet of that.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. We can get to that.</p> <p>5 A. Okay. But just to say, there I do</p> <p>6 discuss the idea that the so-called repair of</p> <p>7 counties and precincts in the State's plan is</p> <p>8 selective and fails to address areas of particular</p> <p>9 salients for Black communities. That would be</p> <p>10 another example.</p> <p>11 Q. And we will walk through all this in a</p> <p>12 little bit more detail.</p> <p>13 A. Sure.</p> <p>14 Q. All right. I want to turn to page 5 of</p> <p>15 your opening report --</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. -- which I have up on the screen. I</p> <p>18 encountered a new word in your report that I had</p> <p>19 never seen before, at least in my memory. Under</p> <p>20 Figure 1 you use this word "choropleth." Did I say</p> <p>21 that correctly?</p> <p>22 A. You did. It's choropleth.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. Can you explain to me what a</p> <p>24 choropleth is?</p> <p>25 A. Gladly. A choropleth is a kind of map</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 Q. And Figure 1 was depicting a percentage?</p> <p>2 A. That's right.</p> <p>3 Q. And Figure 2 appears to depict the total</p> <p>4 number of people. Is that right?</p> <p>5 A. That's right. As I would phrase it,</p> <p>6 it's a share in Figure 1 and a count in Figure 2.</p> <p>7 Q. And in Figure 2 is this only voting age</p> <p>8 population or is this total population?</p> <p>9 A. It says that it's voting age population,</p> <p>10 and so I hope that's correct.</p> <p>11 Q. Is there a reason you used the ACS data</p> <p>12 rather than the decennial census data to generate</p> <p>13 Figure 2?</p> <p>14 A. The pause is me trying to remember the</p> <p>15 circumstances of the creation of this figure. I'm</p> <p>16 not completely sure why that choice was made -- why</p> <p>17 I made that choice, but I will say, as you know,</p> <p>18 that census data was delayed this year.</p> <p>19 The ACS, or American Community Survey,</p> <p>20 had particular difficulty with its 2020 data, so</p> <p>21 2019 -- in fact, the Census Bureau has released</p> <p>22 communications indicating that the 2020 ACS was</p> <p>23 compromised by COVID and other factors. And so</p> <p>24 although I don't, as we sit here, remember the exact</p> <p>25 thought process, I suspect that I was trying to make</p>

10 (Pages 34 - 37)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 38	<p>1 an apples-to-apples comparison between ACS releases</p> <p>2 that were done with similar methodology in 2010 and</p> <p>3 2019.</p> <p>4 Q. Was the decennial census data available</p> <p>5 when you drafted this report?</p> <p>6 A. Definitely.</p> <p>7 Q. And could you have generated Figure 2</p> <p>8 using the decennial census data?</p> <p>9 A. Yes. And I have every reason to believe</p> <p>10 it would be similar.</p> <p>11 Q. But you did not, at least, include that</p> <p>12 in your report.</p> <p>13 A. That's right.</p> <p>14 Q. And do you recall whether you actually</p> <p>15 did, in fact, generate a version of Figure 2 with</p> <p>16 the decennial census data?</p> <p>17 A. I do not recall, but I can assure you</p> <p>18 that this is not cherry-picked to give a different</p> <p>19 impression. I always try to do the best and most</p> <p>20 forthcoming data practice as possible. So it is</p> <p>21 assuredly not the case that a decennial image would</p> <p>22 show a substantially different result and this was</p> <p>23 chosen to give a different impression.</p> <p>24 Q. But as you sit here today, you don't</p> <p>25 know how Figure 2 would look if you had used</p>	Page 40	<p>1 I just would like to get an answer to this question</p> <p>2 for the record. You don't know, as you sit here</p> <p>3 today, what Figure 2 would look like with decennial</p> <p>4 census data. Is that correct?</p> <p>5 A. I have every reason to believe it would</p> <p>6 look similar.</p> <p>7 Q. But you don't know that. Correct?</p> <p>8 A. I wouldn't want to assert that with</p> <p>9 certainty.</p> <p>10 Q. So the answer is you don't know.</p> <p>11 A. I have answered you as best I can.</p> <p>12 Q. Let's go to page 7 of your report where</p> <p>13 you discuss redistricting criteria. And is it</p> <p>14 correct that this section, or part 3, is a review of</p> <p>15 the redistricting criteria in the Guidelines issued</p> <p>16 by the House and Senate?</p> <p>17 A. Yes, that's correct. And I also attempt</p> <p>18 to contextualize that sometimes by appealing to</p> <p>19 sources beyond the State's Guidelines. But it is</p> <p>20 correct to say that the focus is the State's</p> <p>21 Guidelines.</p> <p>22 Q. And you divided the criteria here into</p> <p>23 first-tier and second-tier requirements. Is that</p> <p>24 right?</p> <p>25 A. Yes, following the Guidelines</p>
Page 39	<p>1 decennial census data instead. Is that right?</p> <p>2 A. Well, the only thing I can assure you is</p> <p>3 that it's not the case that I compared them, they</p> <p>4 looked different and I chose this one to give a</p> <p>5 different impression. I can assure you that's not</p> <p>6 the case.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. But you can't -- you don't know,</p> <p>8 one way or the other, what Figure 2 would look like</p> <p>9 with decennial census data, as you sit here today?</p> <p>10 A. I don't -- I don't have it in my mind.</p> <p>11 I will tell you some reasons that ACS data might be</p> <p>12 of interest, as opposed to decennial census data.</p> <p>13 So ACS data -- for example, this figure says it's</p> <p>14 BVAP, as in Black voting age population. It doesn't</p> <p>15 say that it's BCVP, as in Black citizen voting age</p> <p>16 population.</p> <p>17 But one reason to use ACS data sometimes</p> <p>18 is to look at citizen voting age share. That</p> <p>19 doesn't appear to be what I have done here, but I'm</p> <p>20 describing reasons that one might choose the ACS as</p> <p>21 a data product rather than the decennial census.</p> <p>22 Other than that, I am not able, as I sit here, to</p> <p>23 account for why this is done with ACS, except to</p> <p>24 repeat that I assure you it's not cherry-picked.</p> <p>25 Q. I appreciate where you're coming from.</p>	Page 41	<p>1 themselves.</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Did either the House or the</p> <p>3 Senate Guidelines divide the criteria into first and</p> <p>4 second tiers?</p> <p>5 A. Yes. And I describe that here. Let me</p> <p>6 try to remember whether it was House or Senate, but</p> <p>7 one of the two -- and we can pull them up and</p> <p>8 verify -- clearly indicates that the second set may</p> <p>9 not compromise the first. So that does follow the</p> <p>10 Guidelines. Would you like us to find that in the</p> <p>11 Guidelines?</p> <p>12 Q. Yeah. And I'm going to pull those up if</p> <p>13 I can figure out how to do that real quick. Bear</p> <p>14 with me for one second, if you don't mind.</p> <p>15 A. It's the House Guidelines, just to say.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. Can you see the House</p> <p>17 Redistricting Guidelines on your screen?</p> <p>18 A. Yes. And I have a local copy.</p> <p>19 Q. And are these the House Redistricting</p> <p>20 Guidelines we have been discussing and that you</p> <p>21 reference in your report?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 (Exhibit No. 3, 2021 Guidelines and Criteria for</p> <p>24 Congressional and Legislative Redistricting, was</p> <p>25 marked)</p>

11 (Pages 38 - 41)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 42	<p>1 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>2 Q. I have marked these as Exhibit 3. Can</p> <p>3 you point me to where the House Redistricting</p> <p>4 Guidelines divide criteria into first and second</p> <p>5 tiers?</p> <p>6 A. Yes. Although to be clear, "tier" is my</p> <p>7 language. Their language is Priority of Criteria,</p> <p>8 and it's Section IX. So I'm specifically referring</p> <p>9 to IX a. where they say: "In establishing</p> <p>10 Congressional and Legislative districts, all</p> <p>11 criteria identified in these guidelines should be</p> <p>12 considered. However, if there is a conflict among</p> <p>13 the requirements of these guidelines, the</p> <p>14 requirements addressed in Sections I, II, III and IV</p> <p>15 herein should be given priority." So those are the</p> <p>16 ones that I attempted to summarize as first tier.</p> <p>17 Q. Got it. One of those is section III.</p> <p>18 Is that right, the requirements addressed in section</p> <p>19 III?</p> <p>20 A. Correct, I, II, III and IV.</p> <p>21 Q. And section III, back here on page 1,</p> <p>22 refers to South Carolina Constitutional Laws of the</p> <p>23 State and the opinions of the South Carolina Supreme</p> <p>24 Court.</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>	Page 44	<p>1 whether -- to opine on whether state law addresses</p> <p>2 those factors. I can only talk about the way</p> <p>3 that -- I only intend to talk about the way that</p> <p>4 they are described in this document.</p> <p>5 Q. And other than paragraph IX of the House</p> <p>6 Guidelines, was there anything else you did or used</p> <p>7 to determine which criteria would be first tier and</p> <p>8 which criteria would be second tier?</p> <p>9 A. I intended to follow their division.</p> <p>10 Q. And did you discuss this division with</p> <p>11 any members of the South Carolina General Assembly?</p> <p>12 A. No.</p> <p>13 Q. Or any legislative staff?</p> <p>14 A. I did not.</p> <p>15 Q. Let's talk about 3.1, first-tier</p> <p>16 requirements, for just a moment.</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. Minority opportunity. I believe you say</p> <p>19 that the guidelines clearly contemplate the use of</p> <p>20 race data.</p> <p>21 A. I do say that.</p> <p>22 Q. And is it your opinion that the General</p> <p>23 Assembly was obligated to use race data to draw the</p> <p>24 congressional line?</p> <p>25 A. I think that question goes beyond my</p>
Page 43	<p>1 Q. And were any of the criteria you</p> <p>2 identified as first tier in your report state law</p> <p>3 criteria? I'm happy to pull that back up if you</p> <p>4 would like.</p> <p>5 A. I have it here. This might be somewhat</p> <p>6 awkwardly constructed, but I do say in the first</p> <p>7 paragraph, first sentence of section 3.2: "The</p> <p>8 previous criteria I through IV of the House</p> <p>9 Guidelines are rooted in the Constitution and in</p> <p>10 federal and state law."</p> <p>11 Q. That's right here around 3.2? Is that</p> <p>12 what you're referring to?</p> <p>13 A. That's right, the first sentence.</p> <p>14 Q. And these other second-tier requirements</p> <p>15 Contiguity, Compactness, Communities of interest and</p> <p>16 political boundaries, are any of those requirements</p> <p>17 rooted in state law?</p> <p>18 A. Well, I'm not in a good position to</p> <p>19 answer that as a matter of fact about state law, so</p> <p>20 I can only describe and I only mean to describe how</p> <p>21 they are discussed in the House Guidelines. So in</p> <p>22 the House Guidelines those lower-ranked criteria are</p> <p>23 separate from the section that discusses the state</p> <p>24 law.</p> <p>25 I wouldn't go so far as to tell you</p>	Page 45	<p>1 expertise, although I would note that the -- again,</p> <p>2 treating this document, in itself it does assert --</p> <p>3 that is the House Guidelines, treating the House</p> <p>4 Guidelines as a document -- as a self-contained</p> <p>5 document it does assert that this committee has the</p> <p>6 authority to determine the criteria that the House</p> <p>7 will use. I cannot tell you whether I agree with</p> <p>8 that assertion. I can only tell you that assertion</p> <p>9 is made here.</p> <p>10 Q. And do the Guidelines require the</p> <p>11 General Assembly to use race to draw any district</p> <p>12 lines?</p> <p>13 A. Are they required to use race?</p> <p>14 Let's see. No. This says race may be a</p> <p>15 factor, quoting the Guidelines.</p> <p>16 Q. Do you know whether the General Assembly</p> <p>17 used race to draw any lines in the enacted plan?</p> <p>18 A. I am not able to describe their process.</p> <p>19 Is that what you mean?</p> <p>20 Q. I'm asking as a factual matter. You</p> <p>21 have drawn maps, and I imagine that in your</p> <p>22 experience you may have drawn maps that used or did</p> <p>23 not use race one way or another. Now, do you know</p> <p>24 one way or the other what -- and you may not. You</p> <p>25 may not, and that's fine. I'm just trying to</p>

12 (Pages 42 - 45)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 confirm. I'm trying to understand the scope of your</p> <p>2 opinion and your testimony.</p> <p>3 A. I understand. To answer that in the</p> <p>4 most complete manner that I can, I would say there</p> <p>5 are a few different kinds of procedural activities</p> <p>6 that can be described as using race. Sometimes</p> <p>7 people use the phrase to refer to having a data</p> <p>8 layer visible. In other words, there may be a data</p> <p>9 layer that shows you -- for example, like the</p> <p>10 choropleths we looked at before there may be a data</p> <p>11 layer that shows you how much, for example, Black</p> <p>12 population or Black voting age population is in</p> <p>13 every unit. And sometimes people will say I did not</p> <p>14 use race to mean that they turned that data layer</p> <p>15 off or did not make it visible. But of course,</p> <p>16 especially for someone who is intimately familiar</p> <p>17 with South Carolina's political geography, the basic</p> <p>18 contours of race and residential patterns may be</p> <p>19 well known to the line drawer, and it is quite</p> <p>20 impossible to turn that off in one's mind.</p> <p>21 So that's all context to say that I do</p> <p>22 not know whether the line drawers had their race</p> <p>23 layer visible, but I think it would be impossible</p> <p>24 for them to remove all consideration of race from</p> <p>25 their minds if they were familiar with the political</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 My first question is about communities of interest</p> <p>2 and political boundaries. Do the Guidelines treat</p> <p>3 those as a single factor or as separate factors?</p> <p>4 A. So here there is a slight divergence</p> <p>5 between the way the House and the Senate Guidelines</p> <p>6 construct the criteria. Let's see. Let me try to</p> <p>7 recall how this works.</p> <p>8 So the House Guidelines, as I note here</p> <p>9 in the last paragraph that you have on your</p> <p>10 screen -- oh, no. Yes, the last paragraph that you</p> <p>11 have on your screen, the House Guidelines fold what</p> <p>12 is usually a separate principle into the category of</p> <p>13 COIs. That is, political boundaries which are often</p> <p>14 itemized separately are considered by the House</p> <p>15 Guidelines to fall under the umbrella of communities</p> <p>16 of interest. I would not say that this set of</p> <p>17 Guidelines is the only place I have seen it handled</p> <p>18 this way, but it is different from the Senate</p> <p>19 Guidelines which split out respect for counties,</p> <p>20 cities and towns and VTDs under separate headings.</p> <p>21 Q. And is there a reason that you decided</p> <p>22 to put them together, as opposed to treat them as</p> <p>23 separate headings here?</p> <p>24 A. Well, because that was done in the House</p> <p>25 Guidelines.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 and demographic geography of South Carolina.</p> <p>2 Q. And what qualifies you to give the</p> <p>3 opinion as to what may or may not have been in their</p> <p>4 minds?</p> <p>5 A. Well, I'm certainly qualified to opine</p> <p>6 that it may or may not have been in their minds. I</p> <p>7 think that is almost tautological. And I do not</p> <p>8 presume to say what was, in fact, in their minds.</p> <p>9 I'm describing a general state of affairs based, as</p> <p>10 you said, on my experience.</p> <p>11 Q. And so you don't know one way or the</p> <p>12 other, just to summarize, how the general assembly</p> <p>13 may or may not have used race in drawing its --</p> <p>14 A. That's correct. I have no knowledge of</p> <p>15 any procedural details.</p> <p>16 Q. Have you discussed it with any member of</p> <p>17 the General Assembly?</p> <p>18 A. I have not, to my knowledge, met any</p> <p>19 member of the General Assembly, whether in person or</p> <p>20 virtual.</p> <p>21 Q. And how about any staffer?</p> <p>22 A. No.</p> <p>23 Q. And second-tier requirements, I think</p> <p>24 you list four here, Contiguity, Compactness,</p> <p>25 Communities of interest and political boundaries.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 Q. And other than communities of interest,</p> <p>2 political boundaries, compactness and contiguity,</p> <p>3 did the Guidelines identify any other requirements</p> <p>4 for the map drawer to follow or other criteria?</p> <p>5 A. Okay. Right. I would say not</p> <p>6 requirements, but considerations. There are other</p> <p>7 considerations that are mentioned; namely,</p> <p>8 incumbency consideration is section VIII in the</p> <p>9 House Guidelines and implicit in both sets of</p> <p>10 Guidelines.</p> <p>11 Let me open the Senate Guidelines to be</p> <p>12 sure of the wording. Both sets of Guidelines find</p> <p>13 ways to mention the preservation of cores of prior</p> <p>14 districts. In the Senate Guidelines it is called</p> <p>15 Constituent Consistency, section III B. And in the</p> <p>16 House Guidelines it's referenced in various</p> <p>17 subtle ways throughout the discussion, but it does</p> <p>18 not have its own heading.</p> <p>19 (Exhibit No. 4, 2021 Redistricting Guidelines, was</p> <p>20 marked)</p> <p>21 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>22 Q. Now, if I have done this correctly I'm</p> <p>23 displaying Exhibit 4, the Senate Redistricting</p> <p>24 Guidelines. Can you see that?</p> <p>25 A. I can. And I have a copy locally.</p>

13 (Pages 46 - 49)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 50	<p>1 Q. And is the document the Senate</p> <p>2 Guidelines documents that we have been discussing?</p> <p>3 A. It is.</p> <p>4 Q. And is it the one that's referred to in</p> <p>5 your report?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And I think you were referring to III B,</p> <p>8 Constituent Consistency?</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And that expressly says: "Preserving</p> <p>11 the cores of existing districts"?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And E says: "Minimizing Divisions of</p> <p>14 Voting Precinct Boundaries." Is that right?</p> <p>15 A. Correct. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. I'm trying to take us back to your</p> <p>17 report. Can you see that now?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 MR. GORE: Okay. So I'm about to move</p> <p>20 on to the topic area. Would anyone like to take a</p> <p>21 break? We have been going for a little bit over an</p> <p>22 hour.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: I would be happy to take a</p> <p>24 short break.</p> <p>25 MR. GORE: How does five minutes sound?</p>	Page 52	<p>1 such as Pandas and GeoPandas. We sometimes use GIS.</p> <p>2 Q. What are Pandas or GeoPandas?</p> <p>3 A. These are packages that handle data</p> <p>4 frames. And GeoPandas is specifically intended for</p> <p>5 geographical data.</p> <p>6 Q. And is that Python software that you</p> <p>7 used available generally if somebody wants a copy of</p> <p>8 it?</p> <p>9 A. Oh, definitely. Python is freely --</p> <p>10 it's open source, I think. But it's certainly</p> <p>11 freely -- it's free and downloadable and widely</p> <p>12 used. The software, again, we always use</p> <p>13 open-source software to the fullest extent possible.</p> <p>14 Q. And in section 4.1 it's called: "Racial</p> <p>15 demographics." And I believe you used Any Part</p> <p>16 Black to calculate these demographics. Is that</p> <p>17 right?</p> <p>18 A. Correct.</p> <p>19 Q. Do you know which category the General</p> <p>20 Assembly has published on its website or used in</p> <p>21 analyzing plans?</p> <p>22 A. That is a good question. I do not know.</p> <p>23 Q. Is there a reason you used Any Part</p> <p>24 Black, as opposed to some other metric?</p> <p>25 A. I did use it because my impression is</p>
Page 51	<p>1 THE WITNESS: Sounds great.</p> <p>2 (Break In Proceedings)</p> <p>3 MR. GORE: Let's go back on the record.</p> <p>4 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>5 Q. I will, again, attempt to share my</p> <p>6 screen so you can see the report. Can you see</p> <p>7 section 4 of your report?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Starting at section 4. And this section</p> <p>10 is called: "Review of metrics for Congressional</p> <p>11 maps." What did you do to generate the metrics that</p> <p>12 are recorded here in section 4?</p> <p>13 A. So first I took the maps that are listed</p> <p>14 here which were presented on the website for the</p> <p>15 State. And then I used the software that has been</p> <p>16 developed by myself and my lab and collaborators</p> <p>17 over the last few years to run them through the</p> <p>18 metrics. Is that what you mean?</p> <p>19 Q. Yeah. It's a mechanical question, a</p> <p>20 technical question. What is the software called</p> <p>21 that you use?</p> <p>22 A. Well, so we use Python, which is the</p> <p>23 preferred package in data science; for language, I</p> <p>24 should say. We frequently, when it comes to</p> <p>25 geography, use packages that address geographic data</p>	Page 53	<p>1 that it is becoming the standard in litigation that</p> <p>2 involves Black electoral opportunity. For example,</p> <p>3 it was an issue discussed extensively in the Alabama</p> <p>4 case, and the decision of the district court was</p> <p>5 that it was clearly the right measure.</p> <p>6 Q. And could a map drawer use a different</p> <p>7 measure?</p> <p>8 A. Could they or should they?</p> <p>9 Q. Could they?</p> <p>10 A. Certainly could.</p> <p>11 Q. And, in your opinion, should they or</p> <p>12 should they not?</p> <p>13 A. I -- as a matter of demographics, it can</p> <p>14 be quite interesting to split population out in</p> <p>15 different ways.</p> <p>16 As a matter of legal relevance, here</p> <p>17 again I was responding, in part, to the district</p> <p>18 court's decision finding Any Part Black to be the</p> <p>19 salient category.</p> <p>20 Q. And did that district court decision</p> <p>21 hold that map drawers are required to use Any Part</p> <p>22 Black?</p> <p>23 A. Certainly not.</p> <p>24 Q. So this first table, I take it, is just</p> <p>25 a decimal representation of the BVAPs in each of</p>

14 (Pages 50 - 53)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 54	<p>1 these districts. Is that right?</p> <p>2 A. Right. To three decimal places.</p> <p>3 Q. And then the second table here is part</p> <p>4 of Table 1, Table 1A and 1B. But the table at the</p> <p>5 bottom here in Table 1, what does this depict?</p> <p>6 A. Because there is a quite large number of</p> <p>7 plans being discussed, this attempt to summarize the</p> <p>8 number of districts in each over various fairly</p> <p>9 arbitrarily chosen round number demographic lines.</p> <p>10 Q. And are these numbers here cumulative in</p> <p>11 this row? So take previous to 2012.</p> <p>12 A. That is correct. For example, you</p> <p>13 should read this as saying that the South Carolina</p> <p>14 NAACP1 map has two districts over 30 percent BVAP,</p> <p>15 of which one is over 50. That is correct.</p> <p>16 Q. As well as over 40. Right?</p> <p>17 A. Being over 50, yes, is also --</p> <p>18 Q. Is also over 40. So each column is a</p> <p>19 total number of districts in that plan over each</p> <p>20 threshold. Is that right?</p> <p>21 A. That's right. It's a cumulative total.</p> <p>22 Q. So the NAACP plan doesn't have four</p> <p>23 districts. It has three -- or two that are -- tell</p> <p>24 me how many discrete districts or different</p> <p>25 districts are being depicted here for the NAACP1</p>	Page 56	<p>1 plans. Is that right?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>3 Q. And none of the plans had more than one</p> <p>4 district with over 40 percent BVAP. Is that right?</p> <p>5 A. None of these eleven. Correct.</p> <p>6 Q. And here it looks like, in the last</p> <p>7 column, the majority of plans you assessed had only</p> <p>8 one district with over 30 percent BVAP. Is that</p> <p>9 right?</p> <p>10 A. Let's count. One, two, three, four,</p> <p>11 five, six -- six is, indeed, more than half of</p> <p>12 eleven.</p> <p>13 Q. Let's move to Population deviation.</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. 4.2. And you have Table 2 here, and in</p> <p>16 the far right-hand column you marked: Top-to-bottom</p> <p>17 deviation?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. Is that the same as what is sometimes</p> <p>20 described as total deviation?</p> <p>21 A. I have heard that term used in different</p> <p>22 ways, so I'm trying to be precise. I think top to</p> <p>23 bottom is the clearest.</p> <p>24 Q. And it looks like the enacted plan has a</p> <p>25 top-to-bottom deviation of one person. Is that</p>
Page 55	<p>1 plan.</p> <p>2 A. Let's take a look at that line and</p> <p>3 compare it back to the previous table, the one</p> <p>4 that's presented above this. So you can see,</p> <p>5 looking at the first table, that there is -- the</p> <p>6 highest BVAP is .528. The next highest is .349.</p> <p>7 And nothing else is over 30.</p> <p>8 And in the way that is reflected in the</p> <p>9 lower table is that there is a total of two</p> <p>10 districts with BVAP over 30, of which one of them is</p> <p>11 over 40 and, indeed, over 50. So there is a total</p> <p>12 of two districts over 30 percent BVAP. So these are</p> <p>13 cumulative totals in the lower table.</p> <p>14 Q. Of the plans you looked at, does this</p> <p>15 chart mean that only three of them had a district</p> <p>16 that was over 50 percent BVAP?</p> <p>17 A. That's right. That is what it says.</p> <p>18 Q. And nine plans out of these eleven had a</p> <p>19 BVAP -- a district with a BVAP over 40 percent. Is</p> <p>20 that right?</p> <p>21 A. Let's count. One, two, three, four,</p> <p>22 five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven. There</p> <p>23 are eleven in all. And two of them do not, so yes,</p> <p>24 I agree with you, that means nine do.</p> <p>25 Q. And the enacted plan was one of those</p>	Page 57	<p>1 right?</p> <p>2 A. That's right.</p> <p>3 Q. And the SC-NAACP1 has a top-to-bottom</p> <p>4 deviation of two people, NAACP2 is 4, Harpootlian is</p> <p>5 4, and LWVSC is 5. Is that right?</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. So do the NAACP1 and 2 plans and</p> <p>8 Harpootlian and League of Women Voters plans comply</p> <p>9 with the Senate Guidelines?</p> <p>10 A. Okay. Let's take a look. The Senate</p> <p>11 Guidelines say, and I quote: "So that the State may</p> <p>12 avoid assuming this additional burden under federal</p> <p>13 law, a congressional districting plan should not</p> <p>14 have population deviations greater than 1 percent."</p> <p>15 And I believe it is correct to say that they are</p> <p>16 talking about top to bottom, although I could look.</p> <p>17 Yes, they are. They talk about the</p> <p>18 difference between the most populous and least</p> <p>19 populous. So the term here is that they should not</p> <p>20 have population deviations greater than one person.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And so I pulled this up as</p> <p>22 Exhibit 4 again. Can you see that on the screen?</p> <p>23 A. I can.</p> <p>24 Q. And Congressional districts, I think</p> <p>25 it's under I: Requirements Of Federal Law, A.,</p>

15 (Pages 54 - 57)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 58	<p>1 Population equality. 2, Congressional districts.</p> <p>2 Is that what you were reading from?</p> <p>3 A. Correct. I just read the last sentence</p> <p>4 of that paragraph.</p> <p>5 Q. So the Senate was saying it did not want</p> <p>6 to assume the burden of justifying a larger</p> <p>7 deviation. Is that right?</p> <p>8 A. I would just stick to the precise</p> <p>9 language to avoid paraphrase. They say: So that</p> <p>10 the state may avoid assuming this burden, dot, dot,</p> <p>11 dot, a congressional redistricting plan should not</p> <p>12 have population deviations greater than one person.</p> <p>13 Q. And the NAACP plan, the Harpootlian plan</p> <p>14 and the League of Women Voters plan all had</p> <p>15 deviations greater than one person. Correct?</p> <p>16 A. That's correct.</p> <p>17 Q. Let's move to 4.3, Compactness.</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And you use the three measures of</p> <p>20 compactness here: Polsby-Popper, Reock and Block</p> <p>21 Cut Edges. Is that right?</p> <p>22 A. That's right. But to be precise, I</p> <p>23 averaged the Polsby-Popper and the Reock scores over</p> <p>24 the plan.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And so my next question was going</p>	Page 60
Page 59	<p>1 to be if I pronounced Reock correctly. And it</p> <p>2 sounds like I'm in the ballpark, so thank you.</p> <p>3 A. To my knowledge, yes.</p> <p>4 Q. Thank you. How did you choose these</p> <p>5 three metrics?</p> <p>6 A. The Polsby-Popper and the Reock scores</p> <p>7 belong to a class of compactness scores that I call</p> <p>8 contour-based. And as I described it earlier in</p> <p>9 this report they are used -- let's see. I can</p> <p>10 actually quote it from page 8. "An advantage of the</p> <p>11 contour scores" -- and here I mean Reock and</p> <p>12 Polsby-Popper -- "is that they are familiar and in</p> <p>13 wide use." That's why I used those. I also include</p> <p>14 the more recently popular Block cut edges score</p> <p>15 because, as I say here, an advantage of discrete</p> <p>16 scores is that they do not excessively penalize</p> <p>17 districts for having winding boundaries when those</p> <p>18 boundaries come from physical geography like</p> <p>19 coastlines or rivers.</p> <p>20 Q. Thank you. I'm going to scroll back</p> <p>21 now -- thank you. I'm going to scroll back down to</p> <p>22 4.3. In your opinion, was the General Assembly</p> <p>23 obligated to use these metrics to measure</p> <p>24 compactness in the enacted plan?</p> <p>25 A. Obligated by what?</p>	Page 61

16 (Pages 58 - 61)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 Political subdivisions.</p> <p>2 Actually, let me ask you one quick</p> <p>3 question back on compactness, if I might. So even</p> <p>4 under these metrics the enacted plan, it looks like,</p> <p>5 performs better than SC-NAACP1 on all three of these</p> <p>6 metrics. Is that right?</p> <p>7 A. That's right.</p> <p>8 Q. And it performs better than the</p> <p>9 Harpootlian plan on a Reock. Is that right?</p> <p>10 A. That's right. It performs worse on</p> <p>11 Polsby-Popper, substantially worse on block cut</p> <p>12 edges and better on Reock. Correct.</p> <p>13 Q. Thank you. And that's because each of</p> <p>14 these metrics measures a different thing. Is that</p> <p>15 right?</p> <p>16 A. Yes. And that's what those</p> <p>17 illustrations -- those gorgeous illustrations on</p> <p>18 your screen are attempting to illustrate.</p> <p>19 Q. Thank you. All right. Let's move to</p> <p>20 4.4, Political subdivisions.</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And this, again, is just based on</p> <p>23 metrics. You didn't include in this section any</p> <p>24 analysis of other communities of interest. Is that</p> <p>25 right?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 Q. And if I understand correctly, the</p> <p>2 number listed on the left of the slash is total</p> <p>3 splits, and the number on the right is splits</p> <p>4 affecting population. Is that right?</p> <p>5 A. That's exactly right.</p> <p>6 Q. And in your experience as a map drawer,</p> <p>7 why might a map drawer split something that does not</p> <p>8 affect population?</p> <p>9 A. One of the learning experiences for me,</p> <p>10 when I started drawing maps, was just how wild</p> <p>11 municipal boundaries can be. So what frequently</p> <p>12 happens, more in some parts of the country than</p> <p>13 others, that municipalities, as they are officially</p> <p>14 defined, may have spurs with no population.</p> <p>15 Sometimes just almost an individual line that runs</p> <p>16 out of the city and into -- for historical reasons</p> <p>17 and may run for many miles. So sometimes splits to</p> <p>18 municipalities divide these zero population spurs.</p> <p>19 And in this report I'm not offering an opinion on</p> <p>20 whether that's important or not. I'm reporting it</p> <p>21 both ways so that readers of the report can draw</p> <p>22 their own conclusions.</p> <p>23 Q. And on city splits here, we will just</p> <p>24 take column one, it looks like the enacted plan</p> <p>25 performs better than SC-NAACP1 Muscatel, Harrison</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 A. That's right. The divisions that are</p> <p>2 discussed here are counties, county subdivisions,</p> <p>3 cities and towns.</p> <p>4 Q. I'm going to scroll back to page 8.</p> <p>5 Now, is it true that the House Guidelines said that</p> <p>6 counties, municipalities or other political</p> <p>7 subdivisions would be given no greater weight as a</p> <p>8 matter of state policy than other identifiable</p> <p>9 communities of interest?</p> <p>10 A. Yes. That's a direct quote.</p> <p>11 Q. It's right there on page 8. Correct?</p> <p>12 And if we come back here to 4.4, Political</p> <p>13 subdivisions, I believe this is Table 4?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. It appears the enacted plan performs</p> <p>16 better than both SC-NAACP plans on county splits,</p> <p>17 County pieces of subdivision splits and subdivision</p> <p>18 pieces. Is that right?</p> <p>19 A. That's right. Although I would say,</p> <p>20 particularly on subdivision splits, it's virtually</p> <p>21 the same as the second NAACP, 29 versus 30.</p> <p>22 Q. And then you also looked at city splits.</p> <p>23 Is that right?</p> <p>24 A. That's right. Cities and towns are in</p> <p>25 Table 5.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 65</p> <p>1 Sukovich and Roberts. Is that right?</p> <p>2 A. Yes. And worse than SC-NAACP2</p> <p>3 Harpootlian and the League.</p> <p>4 Q. One more question about splits that</p> <p>5 don't affect population.</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. In your experience, or to your knowledge</p> <p>8 are there census blocks that do not contain any</p> <p>9 population?</p> <p>10 A. In the 2010 census, 40 percent of the</p> <p>11 census blocks in the country had no population.</p> <p>12 Q. And how about in the 2020 census, do you</p> <p>13 know one way or the other?</p> <p>14 A. I actually don't know that number. I do</p> <p>15 know that one of the efforts the Census Bureau made</p> <p>16 in 2020 was to reduce the number of census blocks</p> <p>17 nationally. So I suspect that the number 40 percent</p> <p>18 has dropped. Irrespective of that, it is</p> <p>19 unquestionably the case that many blocks have no</p> <p>20 population.</p> <p>21 Q. And does a map drawer have to put those</p> <p>22 blocks in a district somewhere?</p> <p>23 A. That's an interesting question. It</p> <p>24 really depends.</p> <p>25 One thing that stood out to me, in some</p>

17 (Pages 62 - 65)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 of the litigation that I have been involved in, is</p> <p>2 that sometimes maps that are presented differ in how</p> <p>3 they handle which blocks have to be assigned. So I</p> <p>4 would say that there is not complete consensus on</p> <p>5 the question of which blocks have to be assigned but</p> <p>6 that, in my view, it's best practice to assign all</p> <p>7 of the blocks in the state.</p> <p>8 Q. And can assigning census blocks without</p> <p>9 population help make a district to be contiguous of</p> <p>10 a particular shape or something like that?</p> <p>11 A. Definitely.</p> <p>12 Q. Section 4.5 addresses Incumbency. And</p> <p>13 you have listed here incumbent pairings in various</p> <p>14 plans. Is that right?</p> <p>15 A. I have.</p> <p>16 Q. Where did you get the incumbent</p> <p>17 residency information from?</p> <p>18 A. This is from the shapefile that I</p> <p>19 mentioned with electoral data that was provided by</p> <p>20 counsel.</p> <p>21 Q. And so it was preloaded in that file?</p> <p>22 You didn't get it from somewhere else or merge two</p> <p>23 files together or anything like that?</p> <p>24 A. So shapefiles -- even though we say a</p> <p>25 shapefile, a shapefile is actually a collection of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 statistics on VTD splits. I certainly could if that</p> <p>2 would be helpful.</p> <p>3 Q. And did you give any statistics on</p> <p>4 partisan performance?</p> <p>5 A. Not in this section because, indeed,</p> <p>6 partisan performance is not listed among the</p> <p>7 criteria in the Guidelines. But I certainly do</p> <p>8 discuss partisan performance later in my report.</p> <p>9 Q. You said that you focused on the</p> <p>10 criteria that had, quote -- "high billing" I think</p> <p>11 was your phrase. Is that a phrase you used a moment</p> <p>12 ago?</p> <p>13 A. I believe you.</p> <p>14 Q. If I'm wrong you can correct me on the</p> <p>15 transcript. But how did you determine which</p> <p>16 criteria do or do not have high billing or otherwise</p> <p>17 merited inclusion here in section 4?</p> <p>18 A. I'm referring, sort of generally, to</p> <p>19 things like being the heading of a section or being</p> <p>20 in boldface, things like that. So that, for</p> <p>21 example, if you review the House Guidelines you will</p> <p>22 see that core retention is nowhere a section header</p> <p>23 or in boldface. That is an informal</p> <p>24 characterization of the billing in the Guidelines.</p> <p>25 Q. And was the General Assembly prevented</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 files. And so it's a little bit insubstantial to</p> <p>2 talk about whether things were in separate files or</p> <p>3 the same one, but it was all in the same data</p> <p>4 package. It was all in the same delivery.</p> <p>5 Q. And before I go to section 5 I want to</p> <p>6 go back and just round out a few questions on this</p> <p>7 section 4.</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. Did you omit from section 4 any</p> <p>10 traditional criteria contained in the General</p> <p>11 Assembly's Guidelines?</p> <p>12 A. I made an effort to address all the ones</p> <p>13 that had high billing. There isn't a numerical</p> <p>14 discussion of core retention. But again, as we</p> <p>15 reviewed when we looked at the Guidelines before,</p> <p>16 core retention is kind of packaged with other</p> <p>17 considerations in the Guidelines, and it wasn't a</p> <p>18 clear heading, in particular, in the House</p> <p>19 Guidelines. So I do not give core retention</p> <p>20 statistics across the plans but I do give core</p> <p>21 retention statistics in places where I think they</p> <p>22 are relevant in the report.</p> <p>23 Q. And what about VTD splits, did you give</p> <p>24 statistics on VTD splits here?</p> <p>25 A. It does not look like I did give</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 from considering factors that were not in bold</p> <p>2 headings in the Guidelines?</p> <p>3 A. I know of no attempt to restrain them</p> <p>4 from other considerations.</p> <p>5 Q. So could the General Assembly consider</p> <p>6 criteria that were not in bold headings in the</p> <p>7 Guidelines?</p> <p>8 A. Well, my view of my reading here is that</p> <p>9 they can consider anything that they want, but not</p> <p>10 at the expense of the criteria that I listed here.</p> <p>11 Q. Where, in the Guidelines, does it say</p> <p>12 that they can't consider core preservation at the</p> <p>13 expense of these other criteria?</p> <p>14 A. Well, let's see. Well, in particular,</p> <p>15 it says that all criteria -- I'm here reading from</p> <p>16 the House Guidelines, from the last page in Priority</p> <p>17 of Criteria. It says: If there is a conflict among</p> <p>18 the requirements of these guidelines, the</p> <p>19 requirements addressed in the first section should</p> <p>20 be given priority.</p> <p>21 Let's see if I can find anything that</p> <p>22 refers to considerations outside the Guidelines.</p> <p>23 I'm not sure if that's addressed, but I will try to</p> <p>24 find out. I suppose that it is implicit in</p> <p>25 statements such as Incumbency consideration, which</p>

18 (Pages 66 - 69)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 is listed here; therefore, it's a named principle.</p> <p>2 It shall not influence the redistricting plan to</p> <p>3 such an extent as to overtake other redistricting</p> <p>4 principles.</p> <p>5 So though it's not made explicit, I</p> <p>6 would say that a reasonable reader would conclude,</p> <p>7 quite strongly, even, that unnamed criteria also</p> <p>8 cannot overtake the redistricting principles that</p> <p>9 are here named. But I concede to you that that is</p> <p>10 just an attempt to make sense of what's written here</p> <p>11 and not explicit text.</p> <p>12 Q. And are you looking currently at the</p> <p>13 House Guidelines?</p> <p>14 A. I was just reading from the House</p> <p>15 Guidelines. Correct.</p> <p>16 Q. And can you see those on the screen now?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. It takes me a moment to catch up with</p> <p>19 you, so I appreciate your patience. And the House</p> <p>20 Guidelines here, in part VII, mention Communities of</p> <p>21 Interest?</p> <p>22 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>23 Q. Are you aware of any authority or any</p> <p>24 decisions treating existing districts and cores of</p> <p>25 districts as a community of interest?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 My follow-up question is, is preserving</p> <p>2 cores of districts necessarily about incumbency?</p> <p>3 A. I think that it substantially overlaps</p> <p>4 incumbency consideration. There may be</p> <p>5 circumstances where it's decoupled from incumbency,</p> <p>6 such as the retirement of a representative, but as a</p> <p>7 general matter it's very hard to disambiguate core</p> <p>8 preservation from favoring other incumbents.</p> <p>9 Q. And you're saying that as a general</p> <p>10 matter, not necessarily as a South Carolina matter.</p> <p>11 Is that right?</p> <p>12 A. That's correct.</p> <p>13 Q. Are you aware of any requirements or</p> <p>14 restrictions in South Carolina on treating cores of</p> <p>15 districts as a community of interest?</p> <p>16 A. Just to make sure, let me clarify the</p> <p>17 question. You're asking if I know of any rules or</p> <p>18 guidelines that touch on that?</p> <p>19 Q. I'm asking, I think, a slightly</p> <p>20 different question. I think you said, generally,</p> <p>21 that there are states that prohibit consideration of</p> <p>22 incumbency -- or favoring of incumbents in drawing</p> <p>23 districts. Right?</p> <p>24 A. That's right.</p> <p>25 Q. Maybe Florida is one of those, or some</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 A. Can you ask that again, please?</p> <p>2 Q. Certainly. Let me ask it a little bit</p> <p>3 more simply. Can a core of a district or an</p> <p>4 existing district be considered a community of</p> <p>5 interest?</p> <p>6 A. In the eyes of a court?</p> <p>7 Q. Let's start generally. As a general</p> <p>8 matter can it be a community of interest?</p> <p>9 A. In my view, that would be a</p> <p>10 controversial use of the phrase "community of</p> <p>11 interest."</p> <p>12 Q. And why would that be a controversial</p> <p>13 use of the phrase?</p> <p>14 A. Because it overlaps awkwardly with</p> <p>15 incumbency consideration. So first of all, you're</p> <p>16 asking me generally, I believe, and not as pertains</p> <p>17 to South Carolina specifically. So generally --</p> <p>18 Q. At the moment that's right. Yeah.</p> <p>19 A. Right. So generally, I would say quite</p> <p>20 a few states prohibit incumbency consideration. And</p> <p>21 so it certainly would be controversial there to</p> <p>22 smuggle that back in under the guise of communities</p> <p>23 of interest. Does that make sense?</p> <p>24 Q. I understand that. I think it's a</p> <p>25 general matter.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 other states. Correct?</p> <p>2 A. Quite a few, yeah.</p> <p>3 Q. And you said, as a result, that then</p> <p>4 affects the extent to which or whether map drawers</p> <p>5 can consider preservation of cores of districts in</p> <p>6 those states. Is that right?</p> <p>7 A. That's right.</p> <p>8 Q. So I'm just asking, is there anything</p> <p>9 that you're aware of in South Carolina law that</p> <p>10 functions that way and would prohibit consideration</p> <p>11 of preservation of cores?</p> <p>12 A. Right. I understand. No, there is</p> <p>13 nothing in the law that I'm aware of.</p> <p>14 Q. And are you aware of anything in the law</p> <p>15 that would prohibit the General Assembly from</p> <p>16 treating cores of districts as communities of</p> <p>17 interest in South Carolina?</p> <p>18 A. Nothing in the law that I'm aware of.</p> <p>19 Q. Are you aware of anything else that</p> <p>20 would prohibit them from doing so?</p> <p>21 A. I would say that as a matter of good</p> <p>22 government best practices, that there would be some</p> <p>23 significant skepticism of using the communities of</p> <p>24 interest heading in that way.</p> <p>25 Q. And which good government best practices</p>

19 (Pages 70 - 73)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 74	<p>1 are you referring to?</p> <p>2 A. Well, traditional districting principles</p> <p>3 are thought to provide a framework that helps</p> <p>4 redistricting achieve fairer and more objectively</p> <p>5 measurable outcomes. And as such I have been at</p> <p>6 quite a few presentations by nonpartisan groups such</p> <p>7 as NCSL, the National Conference of State</p> <p>8 Legislatures, in which best practices around the</p> <p>9 principles is discussed. And I have never heard a</p> <p>10 discussion in which district cores and incumbency</p> <p>11 are considered to be legitimate communities of</p> <p>12 interest from outside groups. That's not to say</p> <p>13 that there is any law on the subject. I have</p> <p>14 written about the law of communities of interest,</p> <p>15 and it is complicated and far from a unified body of</p> <p>16 decisions. So I'm not claiming there is any clear</p> <p>17 statements in law.</p> <p>18 And again, I'm not a lawyer. So to your</p> <p>19 question, I think the phrase "good government</p> <p>20 principles" refers, generally, to the community of</p> <p>21 people trying to clarify the role of various</p> <p>22 redistricting principles and not to stipulations of</p> <p>23 law.</p> <p>24 Q. Thank you for all that.</p> <p>25 Did you rely on those good government</p>	Page 76	<p>1 summary, section 3B is called: Constituent</p> <p>2 consistency. And it employs the phrase:</p> <p>3 "Preserving the cores of existing districts."</p> <p>4 Q. I'm going to share that again for the</p> <p>5 record. I believe you're reading here off of page</p> <p>6 2, this heading B, Constituent consistency. Is that</p> <p>7 correct?</p> <p>8 A. That's right.</p> <p>9 Q. And how that heading also discusses</p> <p>10 keeping incumbents' residences in their districts</p> <p>11 with their core constituents and avoiding contests</p> <p>12 between incumbent legislators. Did I read that</p> <p>13 correctly?</p> <p>14 A. Yes. It says that all three of those</p> <p>15 should be considered.</p> <p>16 Q. And I'm going to pull up your report</p> <p>17 again if I can figure out how. And here, in section</p> <p>18 4, you discussed incumbent pairing but not</p> <p>19 preserving cores of districts. Is that right?</p> <p>20 A. That's right. In this section I</p> <p>21 discussed incumbent pairing but not core</p> <p>22 preservation.</p> <p>23 Q. All right. I would like to move on now</p> <p>24 to your detailed district review in section 5, if</p> <p>25 that's okay.</p>
Page 75	<p>1 principles or best practices in formulating your</p> <p>2 report?</p> <p>3 A. I don't see that those are anywhere</p> <p>4 referenced in my report.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. Now, you say that the law is</p> <p>6 complicated and far from unified in communities of</p> <p>7 interest. Is that right?</p> <p>8 A. That is right.</p> <p>9 Q. Can you give me an example of what you</p> <p>10 mean by that?</p> <p>11 A. Sure. For instance, the extent to which</p> <p>12 the partisan beliefs of a group constitute a</p> <p>13 legitimate community of interest I think is an</p> <p>14 example where the law of the case law is unclear or</p> <p>15 conflicted. If you want specifics, we could refer</p> <p>16 to various pieces of writing that have been</p> <p>17 published. So I'm speaking now in generality and</p> <p>18 from memory.</p> <p>19 Q. Thank you. And I appreciate the caveat.</p> <p>20 Not a trick question. Thank you.</p> <p>21 A. I'm just trying to be careful and</p> <p>22 complete in my answers.</p> <p>23 Q. And do the Senate Guidelines expressly</p> <p>24 note preserving cores of districts as a criteria?</p> <p>25 A. Let's find out. As I mentioned in my</p>	Page 77	<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Will you briefly describe to me the</p> <p>3 methodology you're using here in section 5?</p> <p>4 A. Sure. So I begin by recalling the BVAP</p> <p>5 by district in the four districts numbered 1, 2, 5</p> <p>6 and 6, as well as the Polsby-Popper score, which is</p> <p>7 the most widely used compactness score in</p> <p>8 litigation. Then I show, in Figure 3, the terrain</p> <p>9 that has moved in and out of District 6 in the</p> <p>10 transition from benchmark map to the enacted map.</p> <p>11 And then in sections 5.1, 2, and 3 I examine,</p> <p>12 serially, Districts 1, 2 and 5 and highlight</p> <p>13 qualitative, as opposed to quantitative, features of</p> <p>14 the districts that seem, to me, to bear on the</p> <p>15 principles.</p> <p>16 Q. Have you offered this kind of</p> <p>17 qualitative analysis in any prior cases in which you</p> <p>18 have been an expert?</p> <p>19 A. Yes. Routinely.</p> <p>20 Q. Let's go to page 15 maybe. This is</p> <p>21 Figure 3. And I believe you said this shows terrain</p> <p>22 moved in and out of CD 6.</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And you said the reassignment is</p> <p>25 happening in scattered chunks and shards. Can you</p>

20 (Pages 74 - 77)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 tell me what you mean by that?</p> <p>2 A. Sure. The colored areas, which are the</p> <p>3 areas that were reassigned, are not one connected</p> <p>4 component or two connected components, but it looks</p> <p>5 like maybe up to ten if -- I'm informally trying to</p> <p>6 count. Some of them are large and some are so small</p> <p>7 that you have to zoom in quite far to see them. So</p> <p>8 that's what merits the colorful phrase "scattered</p> <p>9 chunks and shards."</p> <p>10 Q. And when you talk about areas being</p> <p>11 large or small are you talking about geography or</p> <p>12 population?</p> <p>13 A. Both.</p> <p>14 Q. And these changes involved more than two</p> <p>15 districts. Is that right?</p> <p>16 A. Correct. What you see here is 6 to 2, 6</p> <p>17 to 1. And what does it say here, and into 6 from</p> <p>18 the neighbors.</p> <p>19 Q. And can you show here that any areas</p> <p>20 moved in or out of -- in between 6 and 5?</p> <p>21 A. Unclear. That may be covered in -- let</p> <p>22 me think about that for a moment. Yeah. That's</p> <p>23 unclear because there is purple both on the south</p> <p>24 side of the map. And if you zoom in you can also</p> <p>25 see purple near Columbia. And so I'm not entirely</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 A. I read all of the public testimony and</p> <p>2 made a good-faith effort to summarize and synthesize</p> <p>3 it.</p> <p>4 Q. So it's fair to say you read the public</p> <p>5 hearing transcripts and then drew conclusions based</p> <p>6 on that reading. Is that right?</p> <p>7 A. That's right.</p> <p>8 Q. And have you ever used that method</p> <p>9 before in any of your prior expert reports?</p> <p>10 A. Let's see. I'm trying to think those</p> <p>11 through. I certainly have used selections from</p> <p>12 public hearing testimony before, but I will say that</p> <p>13 in many of my prior expert reports the state</p> <p>14 collected not only oral testimony, narrative</p> <p>15 testimony, but also collected maps. And when the</p> <p>16 state collects maps it's possible to synthesize</p> <p>17 those as a matter of data science. When the state</p> <p>18 collects only narratives, it is much more difficult</p> <p>19 to synthesize precisely.</p> <p>20 Q. So in any of your prior expert reports</p> <p>21 have you done what you did here, which was to read</p> <p>22 all the public hearing testimony and then identify</p> <p>23 certain communities within that testimony?</p> <p>24 A. Yes, and particular in Wisconsin.</p> <p>25 Q. And so --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 sure whether that -- some of that may well be</p> <p>2 involving District 5. It's not identified in</p> <p>3 this -- in this plot.</p> <p>4 Q. All right. And you also say that the</p> <p>5 reassignment is not aimed at healing key splits of</p> <p>6 cities and communities that were frequently cited in</p> <p>7 the public testimony, including Columbia, Sumter</p> <p>8 Orangeburg and Charleston. Is that right?</p> <p>9 A. Yes, that is an accurate quote.</p> <p>10 Q. Do either the House or the Senate</p> <p>11 Guidelines say anything about these particular</p> <p>12 communities and whether they should be split or</p> <p>13 reunified?</p> <p>14 A. These communities are not named in the</p> <p>15 Guidelines.</p> <p>16 Q. Were any of these communities split in</p> <p>17 the benchmark plan from 2010?</p> <p>18 A. I think it's implied here, by the word</p> <p>19 "healing," that they were split. And when I say</p> <p>20 that they are not aimed at healing, I mean those</p> <p>21 splits were not addressed or lessened in the move</p> <p>22 from the benchmark to the enacted plan.</p> <p>23 Q. How did you identify these four</p> <p>24 communities of interest for this portion of your</p> <p>25 report?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 A. Sorry. Excuse me. It's also addressing</p> <p>2 the South Carolina State House districts also in</p> <p>3 that report.</p> <p>4 Q. Got it. And do you have -- is there any</p> <p>5 support or discussion of this particular method in</p> <p>6 any academic literature that you're aware of?</p> <p>7 A. That is, is there any discussion of the</p> <p>8 method of using public testimony to identify</p> <p>9 communities of interest?</p> <p>10 Q. To identify a subset of communities of</p> <p>11 interest.</p> <p>12 A. I'm sorry. Could you rephrase?</p> <p>13 Q. Sure. Let me ask you this: Were these</p> <p>14 the only four communities of interest identified in</p> <p>15 the public testimony?</p> <p>16 A. I see. No, certainly not. Thank you</p> <p>17 for rephrasing.</p> <p>18 Q. Yeah. Sorry.</p> <p>19 Okay. So I want to understand how you</p> <p>20 identified these four out of the various communities</p> <p>21 of interest that were identified in the public</p> <p>22 hearing testimony. So can you tell me why you</p> <p>23 identified these four, as opposed to other</p> <p>24 communities of interest?</p> <p>25 A. Sure. And incidentally, if you look at</p>

21 (Pages 78 - 81)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 Figure 13 in my report, which is on page 30, you 2 will see one, two, three, four -- five areas 3 highlighted, which I call "A selection of COIs 4 identified in public testimony." So this is page 5 30.</p> <p>6 Q. Right. I think I'm there. I'm sorry. 7 These are different than what you have got in the 8 form we were just talking about. Correct?</p> <p>9 A. To be clear, this is labeled "A 10 selection." But yeah, let me try to restate and 11 clarify the broader point that I'm making.</p> <p>12 The testimony in South Carolina, which I 13 made a significant effort to contend with in its 14 entirety, was exclusively narrative. And that makes 15 it quite challenging to do what a data scientist 16 would call operationalizing the testimony into 17 chunks that you might consider individual COIs. 18 However, I have made a good-faith effort to do that 19 by looking for themes in the public testimony and 20 trying to do so in an even-handed way.</p> <p>21 Q. How did you determine which communities 22 of interest discussed in the public hearing 23 testimony to include in your report?</p> <p>24 A. I attempted to find the ones most 25 frequently discussed and most explicitly delineated.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 quantification or quantitative analysis in 2 communities of interest. Is that right?</p> <p>3 A. I think maybe a good way to answer your 4 question would be to say what academic domain this 5 falls in. So this falls in an area that has a huge 6 literature called "participatory mapping" that's 7 part of the academic geography literature. I would 8 say there are hundreds of papers on participatory 9 mapping and the idea of taking seriously public 10 input, grass-roots input. So I don't know that any 11 of those papers focuses specifically on applications 12 to redistricting, but there is really no shortage of 13 both qualitative and quantitate support for the idea 14 of community mapping.</p> <p>15 Q. And here I'm just looking for a simple 16 yes or no answer to this next question.</p> <p>17 A. Sure.</p> <p>18 Q. Is there any academic literature that 19 discusses the method you used here, in this report, 20 this specific method?</p> <p>21 A. I'm trying to give you the yes or no 22 answer. I would say the detailed method used here, 23 no.</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. Thank you. And how about are you 25 aware of any court decisions or opinions discussing</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 It is a good-faith effort to do just that.</p> <p>2 Q. And as part of that good-faith effort 3 did you count the number of comments or the number 4 of commenters? I'm just trying to understand how 5 you determined what was getting more or less 6 emphasis than something else.</p> <p>7 A. To be clear, I would have greatly 8 preferred a more data-intensive record. But from 9 the narrative record I made a complete but 10 qualitative review.</p> <p>11 Q. And are you aware of any academic 12 literature that discusses, supports or endorses the 13 kind of qualitative review you undertook here?</p> <p>14 A. Well, I have a book chapter that 15 discusses the use of public testimony. I have a 16 paper under review that discusses the quantification 17 methods you can use when that testimony is 18 accompanied with maps. I'm trying to think of other 19 examples.</p> <p>20 Generally, I would say there is a 21 shortage of peer-reviewed work on communities of 22 interest, generally; something I hope to address in 23 the coming months and years.</p> <p>24 Q. And to the extent that that literature 25 exists, I think I heard you say that it was a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 the detailed method that you employed here in this 2 report?</p> <p>3 A. All right. I do think -- and please 4 tell me if this is responsive to your question 5 because I'm sincerely trying to be, I do think there 6 are cases where courts have taken, quite seriously, 7 informal communities of interest, as reflected in 8 the public record. For instance, in Texas.</p> <p>9 Q. And I'm looking for just a yes or no 10 answer to the next question.</p> <p>11 A. Sure.</p> <p>12 Q. Are you aware, one way or the other, 13 whether any court has discussed the specific method 14 you used in this report?</p> <p>15 A. While I would love to give you a simple 16 yes or no, I think too much hinges on what's meant 17 by "the specific method." I'm sorry. But I would 18 say that I'm trying to follow what I take to be the 19 way courts have used communities of interest. I am 20 trying to follow that here to the best of my ability 21 with the public record available.</p> <p>22 Q. Is public testimony in a redistricting 23 record statistically random?</p> <p>24 A. I don't understand the question.</p> <p>25 Q. Is public testimony -- who can provide</p>

22 (Pages 82 - 85)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 86	<p>1 public testimony?</p> <p>2 A. Okay. In many states anyone can. For</p> <p>3 instance, the cycle in Michigan, the commission</p> <p>4 debated whether only residents could provide</p> <p>5 testimony and decided that it would be open to</p> <p>6 anyone.</p> <p>7 Q. And among the people who show up to</p> <p>8 testify, for example, are they a statistically</p> <p>9 random sample of the statewide population?</p> <p>10 A. I'm not sure I understand what that</p> <p>11 would mean, but I think the spirit is are they --</p> <p>12 are there any statistics gathered on commenters. Am</p> <p>13 I understanding right?</p> <p>14 Q. Well, what I really want to understand</p> <p>15 is, are commenters, whoever shows up to comment in a</p> <p>16 public -- in public hearing, can we extrapolate from</p> <p>17 that that their views represent the views of the</p> <p>18 entire state or the populous at large from which</p> <p>19 they are drawn?</p> <p>20 A. Well, certainly not. With any public</p> <p>21 anticipatory effort there is always going to be a</p> <p>22 kind of small sample. And it's hard to say exactly</p> <p>23 what that might represent in terms of the overall</p> <p>24 views of all residents, all adults, all voters or</p> <p>25 some other universe.</p>	Page 88	<p>1 resources not to take it seriously as the best</p> <p>2 record we have of residents characterizing their own</p> <p>3 communities.</p> <p>4 Q. And regardless of whether it is the best</p> <p>5 we have or is something that the General Assembly</p> <p>6 should have, could have or did, in fact, take</p> <p>7 account of, I'm asking a slightly different</p> <p>8 question, which is, do the points of emphasis -- can</p> <p>9 you say, one way or the other, whether the points of</p> <p>10 emphasis in the public testimony accurately</p> <p>11 represent the views of the points of emphasis of the</p> <p>12 populous generally in South Carolina?</p> <p>13 A. I think it's reasonable to assume a</p> <p>14 correlation. Is that what you mean? It's not going</p> <p>15 to be the entirety, necessarily, but I think it's</p> <p>16 reasonable to assume correlation.</p> <p>17 Q. And have you conducted any analysis,</p> <p>18 either survey analysis or anything like that to try</p> <p>19 to capture the views of individuals who did not</p> <p>20 provide public hearing testimony with respect to</p> <p>21 communities of interest?</p> <p>22 A. In South Carolina, certainly not.</p> <p>23 Q. And did plaintiff's counsel ever</p> <p>24 instruct you to focus, back on page 15, on these</p> <p>25 four communities, Columbia, Sumter, Orangeburg and</p>
Page 87	<p>1 Q. So if I can just briefly summarize, the</p> <p>2 public testimony does not necessarily represent the</p> <p>3 views of all voters or all residents of the state.</p> <p>4 Is that correct?</p> <p>5 A. It certainly does not represent the</p> <p>6 views of all voters. It could not.</p> <p>7 Q. And I think you said that you were</p> <p>8 looking for communities of interest that got</p> <p>9 particular focus or emphasis in the public hearing</p> <p>10 testimony. Is that right?</p> <p>11 A. That's right. I looked for themes, is</p> <p>12 the phrase that I used.</p> <p>13 Q. And so would those communities of</p> <p>14 interest necessarily be a point of focus or emphasis</p> <p>15 for all voters or all individuals in the state?</p> <p>16 A. Again, I clearly concede that there is</p> <p>17 no way testimony could possibly capture everything.</p> <p>18 That's certain.</p> <p>19 Q. But would the weight of that testimony</p> <p>20 be representative of the weight of the views among</p> <p>21 all residents or all voters in the state?</p> <p>22 A. Well, I believe that it's the best we</p> <p>23 have, that, in fact, considerable effort was</p> <p>24 expended by the State to collect it. And it strikes</p> <p>25 me that it would be misuse of that time and those</p>	Page 89	<p>1 Charleston?</p> <p>2 A. No. These were my own choices.</p> <p>3 Q. And I think you have already testified</p> <p>4 that there were other communities of interest</p> <p>5 identified in the public hearing testimony. Is that</p> <p>6 right?</p> <p>7 A. Yes. I would estimate that the public</p> <p>8 testimony probably runs to over 1,000 pages. So it</p> <p>9 certainly discusses many other areas.</p> <p>10 Q. That sounds low to me, even, 1,000</p> <p>11 pages.</p> <p>12 A. I'm trying to be conservative with my</p> <p>13 numbers.</p> <p>14 Q. That makes sense. Okay.</p> <p>15 So let's move on to 5.1, District One.</p> <p>16 And you again -- is this a choropleth. Am I saying</p> <p>17 that right, choropleth here, Figure 4?</p> <p>18 A. It is, highlighting District 1.</p> <p>19 Q. All right. So you mention here, under A</p> <p>20 is the Jasper County split. And you note that two</p> <p>21 Jasper County precincts are included in the new</p> <p>22 District 1. Is that right?</p> <p>23 A. That's right.</p> <p>24 Q. Are you aware of any public testimony</p> <p>25 that supported splitting these two precincts from</p>

23 (Pages 86 - 89)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 the rest of Jasper County?</p> <p>2 A. Off the top of my head, no. If I go to</p> <p>3 selections from public testimony, I see that I have</p> <p>4 included, on page 31, one selection, which is Mary</p> <p>5 Ann Bromley who says: "The economic importance of</p> <p>6 the Jasper Port Project is an excellent example of a</p> <p>7 shared community of interest for residents of both</p> <p>8 counties in that area." So if anything, Bromley's</p> <p>9 quote goes to the idea that this area should be kept</p> <p>10 together.</p> <p>11 Q. And are you aware of any other testimony</p> <p>12 in the public record or do you recall any today that</p> <p>13 might actually support this split of Jasper County?</p> <p>14 A. No. It's entirely possible that there</p> <p>15 is some.</p> <p>16 Q. And the next, under B you mention</p> <p>17 Dorchester County.</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. And was Dorchester split in the</p> <p>20 benchmark plan?</p> <p>21 A. Let's see. I don't mention that here</p> <p>22 and so I don't have materials in front of me to make</p> <p>23 that determination.</p> <p>24 Q. And are you aware of any public</p> <p>25 testimony that supported splitting Dorchester</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. So Dr. Duchin, do you recall any</p> <p>3 testimony about --</p> <p>4 A. Sorry. I lost sound there.</p> <p>5 Q. Can you hear me now?</p> <p>6 A. I can, yes.</p> <p>7 Q. Wonderful. Do you recall any testimony</p> <p>8 in a public record identifying Beaufort County as a</p> <p>9 community of interest?</p> <p>10 A. Yes. I have quite a few commenters,</p> <p>11 cited on pages 31, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 that all mention</p> <p>12 Beaufort.</p> <p>13 Q. And are you aware -- turning back now to</p> <p>14 Dorchester County, are you aware of any other</p> <p>15 justifications for the splits in Dorchester?</p> <p>16 A. Other than public testimony?</p> <p>17 Q. Yes. Let me ask it this way. It's,</p> <p>18 again, not a trick question. Did you examine</p> <p>19 whether there are any justifications for splitting</p> <p>20 Dorchester County, say, in the legislative record?</p> <p>21 A. Okay. I can say that I did not examine</p> <p>22 the legislative proceedings. I restricted my review</p> <p>23 to the already voluminous public testimony on</p> <p>24 community.</p> <p>25 Q. And then you mention the Coastal and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 County?</p> <p>2 A. I am not, off the top of my head. But</p> <p>3 if I go back to the selections from public testimony</p> <p>4 I can see that I quoted one person, Tim Lewis, who</p> <p>5 identified the county as a community of interest.</p> <p>6 Incidentally, let me mention, this</p> <p>7 frequently occurred in the public testimony, in my</p> <p>8 review, that people talked about their county as</p> <p>9 their community of interest.</p> <p>10 Q. Were there any other examples that you</p> <p>11 can think of?</p> <p>12 A. Not off the top of my head.</p> <p>13 Q. And do you recall whether there was any</p> <p>14 such testimony with respect to Berkeley County?</p> <p>15 A. Let's see. I do have selections in the</p> <p>16 supplement on pages 34, 35 and 36 that all mention</p> <p>17 Berkeley County in various ways.</p> <p>18 Q. And how about what I believe South</p> <p>19 Carolinians refer to as Beaufort, B-E-A-U-F-O-R-T?</p> <p>20 And I see Leah nodding, so I hope I got</p> <p>21 that in the ballpark.</p> <p>22 MS. ADEN: I'm not the one to give you</p> <p>23 the green light.</p> <p>24 MR. MATHIAS: Soften the T a little more</p> <p>25 and you will be there.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 Lowcountry COIs disregarded. And I believe that's</p> <p>2 your heading C here on page 16. Is that right?</p> <p>3 A. That is right.</p> <p>4 Q. And was Charleston split in the</p> <p>5 benchmark plan?</p> <p>6 A. I believe that it was; although I don't,</p> <p>7 again, have the benchmark plan in front of me.</p> <p>8 Q. That's fine. Are you aware of any</p> <p>9 public testimony that supported splitting</p> <p>10 Charleston -- or maintaining a split of Charleston</p> <p>11 into two districts?</p> <p>12 A. I could not quote such testimony as I</p> <p>13 sit here, but it is entirely possible that there was</p> <p>14 testimony of that kind.</p> <p>15 Q. So Colleton County -- I think I know the</p> <p>16 answer to this question. You mentioned Colleton.</p> <p>17 But do you know, as you sit here right now, whether</p> <p>18 Colleton County was split in the benchmark plan?</p> <p>19 A. There is testimony referring to</p> <p>20 Colleton's split that's included here, so that gives</p> <p>21 me reason to believe that it was split.</p> <p>22 Q. And are you aware of any public</p> <p>23 testimony that supported splitting Colleton County</p> <p>24 or maintaining a split in Colleton County?</p> <p>25 A. I am checking what is included here.</p>

24 (Pages 90 - 93)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 94	<p>1 From what I included, what I see is that the mayor</p> <p>2 of Walterboro testified that Colleton is very</p> <p>3 divided, but that it would be kept, quote, together</p> <p>4 as much as possible as a community of interest.</p> <p>5 That's not to say that other testimony might not</p> <p>6 have -- you will find this quite frequently, that</p> <p>7 you can have testimony preferring one thing and</p> <p>8 testimony preferring an opposite thing. And I don't</p> <p>9 deny that that is possible. Again, it's a huge</p> <p>10 record and it's all narrative.</p> <p>11 Q. And how about Beaufort? Do you know</p> <p>12 whether Beaufort was split in the benchmark plan?</p> <p>13 A. I don't have a benchmark plan in front</p> <p>14 of me. I'm sorry.</p> <p>15 Q. Now, you mention here that the</p> <p>16 Harpootlian proposal is highly cognizant of the</p> <p>17 COIs.</p> <p>18 A. I did.</p> <p>19 Q. What do you mean by that?</p> <p>20 A. Well, let's look at page 3 which shows</p> <p>21 images of the districting plans. I find that, in</p> <p>22 particular, in the Lowcountry area, Harpootlian and</p> <p>23 Coastal regions of the South that Harpootlian has, I</p> <p>24 think visually prioritized maintaining those</p> <p>25 counties in that region together.</p>	Page 96	<p>1 this timeline, but I have no reason to believe this</p> <p>2 not to be true. And that in his introduction of the</p> <p>3 plan, as an amendment, discussed the elements of --</p> <p>4 some of the elements of community that were in play.</p> <p>5 Q. And this timeline that you received from</p> <p>6 counsel, was that in writing?</p> <p>7 A. No. And by "timeline" here I mean only</p> <p>8 the informal sense that the NAACP plans had been</p> <p>9 introduced before the public testimony was complete.</p> <p>10 That's my impression from informal conversations.</p> <p>11 But that is what I'm referring to as timeline, and</p> <p>12 that some of the legislative debate had already been</p> <p>13 ongoing at the time that the Harpootlian amendment</p> <p>14 was introduced. My impression, again, is that it</p> <p>15 came late in the process.</p> <p>16 Q. A moment ago when you were discussing</p> <p>17 the Harpootlian plan, I believe you said it's</p> <p>18 difficult for a plan to be superlative on all</p> <p>19 metrics.</p> <p>20 A. I did.</p> <p>21 Q. Well, what did you mean by that?</p> <p>22 A. Well, I meant that as all of us in the</p> <p>23 redistricting trenches know, that redistricting</p> <p>24 involves tradeoffs between the metrics. If you</p> <p>25 optimize on one, you might do so at cost to some</p>
Page 95	<p>1 I, in my review of the metrics, found</p> <p>2 that Harpootlian seemed to take the public testimony</p> <p>3 into account while still having an excellent showing</p> <p>4 on most of the metrics, though it's very hard to be</p> <p>5 superlative on all the metrics simultaneously.</p> <p>6 I'm sorry. I want to make sure I'm</p> <p>7 answering your question. So you were asking</p> <p>8 specifically why I thought Harpootlian had taken the</p> <p>9 public testimony into account?</p> <p>10 Q. I believe what it says on 16 is the</p> <p>11 Harpootlian proposal is highly cognizant of these</p> <p>12 COIs. And I'm trying to understand the phrase</p> <p>13 "highly cognizant," whether you're just saying they</p> <p>14 are not splitting his plan or there is something</p> <p>15 else that was done with respect to these communities</p> <p>16 of interest in the Harpootlian proposal that I may</p> <p>17 have missed.</p> <p>18 A. Right. So I mentioned before that one</p> <p>19 of the sets of facts that was related to me by</p> <p>20 counsel had to do with the timeline of when maps</p> <p>21 were introduced relative to public testimony, and so</p> <p>22 it's my understanding that Harpootlian is one of the</p> <p>23 ones that was released after all of the public</p> <p>24 testimony had been completed. This is my</p> <p>25 understanding. I have not independently verified</p>	Page 97	<p>1 others. So it's hard to simultaneously be the best</p> <p>2 plan in contention on each of the twenty or so</p> <p>3 different metrics in play. But given that, I find</p> <p>4 Harpootlian to really be very strong in its</p> <p>5 balancing with the tradeoffs.</p> <p>6 Q. And is the Harpootlian plan the only</p> <p>7 plan that strikes a strong balance on the various</p> <p>8 tradeoffs?</p> <p>9 A. Let me think about a reasonable response</p> <p>10 to that. I can identify strengths and weaknesses in</p> <p>11 a number of the plans. But through the process of</p> <p>12 review Harpootlian emerged, in my opinion, as a</p> <p>13 particularly strong option that was available to the</p> <p>14 legislature at the time of enactment.</p> <p>15 Q. And in your opinion and experience how</p> <p>16 does a map drawer -- or how should a map drawer</p> <p>17 determine where to strike the balance on these</p> <p>18 various tradeoffs?</p> <p>19 A. Well, in my experience, a map drawer</p> <p>20 usually is either under an assignment to produce a</p> <p>21 demonstration of some principles or is trying to</p> <p>22 qualitatively optimize in view of law and local</p> <p>23 practice. So how should they strike the balance? I</p> <p>24 couldn't answer that in generality.</p> <p>25 Q. And so some of that turns on additional</p>

25 (Pages 94 - 97)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 98	<p>1 assignments or instructions a map drawer might</p> <p>2 receive. Is that right?</p> <p>3 A. That's right.</p> <p>4 Q. And what's an example of that, in your</p> <p>5 experience or observation?</p> <p>6 A. For instance, they might be instructed</p> <p>7 to use a particular compactness metric. That's an</p> <p>8 example. Or they might be instructed to split --</p> <p>9 they might -- you know, I will use North Carolina as</p> <p>10 an example, where legislative plans are under a very</p> <p>11 stringent whole-county provision that makes it clear</p> <p>12 exactly how to treat the requirements around county</p> <p>13 splits. It's more explicit in North Carolina than</p> <p>14 in most of the country. So if you were drawing</p> <p>15 there, you would need to be cognizant of that</p> <p>16 framework.</p> <p>17 Q. So let me just ask another hypothetical.</p> <p>18 If a map drawer was told to place emphasis on</p> <p>19 preserving communities of interest, for example,</p> <p>20 might that affect the compactness score of the map</p> <p>21 or result in a map that's less compact than if your</p> <p>22 map drawer had been told to consider compactness</p> <p>23 over communities of interest?</p> <p>24 A. Certainly.</p> <p>25 Q. And would the same be true of, say, with</p>	Page 100	<p>1 articulated publicly.</p> <p>2 Q. And with respect to those publicly</p> <p>3 articulated principles, isn't it correct that</p> <p>4 keeping these counties together would have involved</p> <p>5 tradeoffs with other of the publicly available</p> <p>6 principles?</p> <p>7 A. I will say it could have, definitely.</p> <p>8 Q. And I think you mentioned that the state</p> <p>9 might have been prioritizing criteria that are</p> <p>10 not -- were not in the public guidelines. Is that</p> <p>11 right?</p> <p>12 A. Definitely.</p> <p>13 Q. And are you aware of any legal</p> <p>14 prohibition on considering those criteria in South</p> <p>15 Carolina?</p> <p>16 A. No. I think we have discussed the full</p> <p>17 extent of the legal framework that I am aware of.</p> <p>18 So just to be clear, the example that I</p> <p>19 just gave was partisanship. And I am not aware of</p> <p>20 any law that prevents the legislature from</p> <p>21 prioritizing partisan motives.</p> <p>22 Q. And are you aware of anything in the law</p> <p>23 that prevents the legislature from considering a</p> <p>24 private criteria -- criterion over the publicly</p> <p>25 available criteria?</p>
Page 99	<p>1 preservation of cores and compactness?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, I would say the same would be true</p> <p>3 with, virtually, any two principles; that there</p> <p>4 would be intention, and optimizing one could be</p> <p>5 expected to come at a cost to another.</p> <p>6 Q. So turning to page 16, would keeping</p> <p>7 Jasper County, Dorchester County and these other</p> <p>8 counties together have required tradeoffs with other</p> <p>9 criteria or objectives the General Assembly might</p> <p>10 have wanted to pursue?</p> <p>11 A. Yes. And I will add to that there is a</p> <p>12 strong possibility, and I think a possibility that's</p> <p>13 reflected in various documents in this court case,</p> <p>14 that the state was prioritizing criteria not named</p> <p>15 in the Guidelines. In particular, partisanship is</p> <p>16 not explicitly named in the Guidelines but is</p> <p>17 discussed in various documents that have come out in</p> <p>18 this litigation, like in the motion to dismiss and</p> <p>19 the expert report of Sean Trende and so on.</p> <p>20 So it's entirely possible that the State</p> <p>21 had various private principles, but the publicly</p> <p>22 expressed principles are the ones -- the only ones</p> <p>23 that the public could have been aware of when they</p> <p>24 prepared plans to submit for consideration. They</p> <p>25 cannot have been aware of principles that weren't</p>	Page 101	<p>1 A. Well, I would say that the Voting Rights</p> <p>2 Act and Equal Protection do govern, in part, the</p> <p>3 proper prioritization, the proper role of</p> <p>4 considerations that touch on race. Are you asking</p> <p>5 in that generality, or could you --</p> <p>6 Q. Yeah, I'm happy to clarify the question,</p> <p>7 if that would be helpful.</p> <p>8 A. I think it would.</p> <p>9 Q. That's fine. I think you said that</p> <p>10 you're not aware of any prohibition on considering</p> <p>11 partisanship. Right?</p> <p>12 A. That's right.</p> <p>13 Q. So now I want to talk about the</p> <p>14 difference between publicly available criteria and</p> <p>15 private criteria. And so it's not necessarily a</p> <p>16 question about partisanship, but the question is, is</p> <p>17 there any prohibition, to your knowledge, on a map</p> <p>18 drawer or General Assembly considering private</p> <p>19 criteria --</p> <p>20 A. Right.</p> <p>21 Q. -- that are not public?</p> <p>22 A. And again, my answer is, only some. So,</p> <p>23 for instance, it would not be proper, it would not</p> <p>24 be legal, in my understanding, to privately choose</p> <p>25 to disfavor members of a particular racial or</p>

26 (Pages 98 - 101)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 language minority group. That's just an example.</p> <p>2 But --</p> <p>3 Q. Right. I'm sorry. Finish your answer.</p> <p>4 A. Just that there are very few</p> <p>5 restrictions of that kind in the law that I'm aware</p> <p>6 of.</p> <p>7 Q. But even in that example it's not the</p> <p>8 fact that that criterion is private.</p> <p>9 A. That's correct.</p> <p>10 Q. It's that it's illegal.</p> <p>11 A. That's correct. It's not the fact of</p> <p>12 having been private, but in some possibilities the</p> <p>13 nature of the private motivation.</p> <p>14 Q. And so focusing just on the fact that</p> <p>15 something is private, does the fact that a criterion</p> <p>16 is private mean a map drawer or General Assembly is</p> <p>17 prohibited from considering it?</p> <p>18 A. I think -- just to answer the question</p> <p>19 technically first, I think they can consider</p> <p>20 anything at all. However, I do think that when</p> <p>21 those considerations start to come at a cost to the</p> <p>22 ones that are named in law, that that's where you</p> <p>23 could run into trouble. But I truly -- in an honest</p> <p>24 effort to address your question as you asked it,</p> <p>25 anything can be considered. But if those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 Q. May I try to rephrase it, then?</p> <p>2 A. Please.</p> <p>3 Q. Would that be okay?</p> <p>4 Are you aware of any prohibition on a</p> <p>5 map drawer or General Assembly considering a legal</p> <p>6 criterion that it has kept private and not disclosed</p> <p>7 publicly?</p> <p>8 A. Just to repeat, I think they are</p> <p>9 allowed, legally, to consider anything that is</p> <p>10 legally permissible.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. Thank you. And then my next</p> <p>12 question on this is, are you aware of any</p> <p>13 prohibition on a map drawer or General Assembly</p> <p>14 prioritizing a legal criterion that it has kept</p> <p>15 private over criteria it has made public?</p> <p>16 A. Well --</p> <p>17 Q. It's a yes or no, if that's possible.</p> <p>18 A. You're asking if I know of a law.</p> <p>19 Right?</p> <p>20 Q. Yes.</p> <p>21 A. I do not know of such a law.</p> <p>22 MR. GORE: Can we maybe take a minute to</p> <p>23 go off the record for a second?</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: Fine with me.</p> <p>25 (Discussion Off The Record)</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 considerations come at a cost to the traditional</p> <p>2 principles, that might start to invite scrutiny.</p> <p>3 Q. Well, it might invite scrutiny, but is</p> <p>4 it illegal?</p> <p>5 MS. ADEN: Objection.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I would say that, in my</p> <p>7 understanding, that just really depends on the</p> <p>8 nature of what is being prioritized. At a cost to</p> <p>9 what?</p> <p>10 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>11 Q. But that analysis, in your experience,</p> <p>12 doesn't turn on whether the criterion is private or</p> <p>13 public?</p> <p>14 A. Okay. Let me -- let me disambiguate two</p> <p>15 things. So one is whether something might be</p> <p>16 legally suspect, and another is whether it might be</p> <p>17 against the law. So I think there is a special role</p> <p>18 in the law around redistricting related to -- I</p> <p>19 think race, generally, is treated with a whole host</p> <p>20 of special provisions in the law. In particular,</p> <p>21 the role of intent versus results is special for</p> <p>22 race in current law.</p> <p>23 And so to your question about whether</p> <p>24 private considerations are prohibited, I find that</p> <p>25 question too general to answer.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 (Break In Proceedings)</p> <p>2 MR. GORE: Back on the record.</p> <p>3 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>4 Q. Dr. Duchin, did you discuss this case</p> <p>5 with anyone during your break?</p> <p>6 A. No, I didn't talk to anyone during the</p> <p>7 break.</p> <p>8 Q. All right. Let's go back to your report</p> <p>9 that I have pulled up here. Can you see this on</p> <p>10 your screen?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. Let's go to page 17, Figure 5.</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. Can you just tell me what these red and</p> <p>15 black lines are?</p> <p>16 A. Yes. The red lines are the municipal</p> <p>17 boundaries of Charleston and North Charleston, and</p> <p>18 the black ones are district boundaries.</p> <p>19 Q. So these are not county boundaries,</p> <p>20 then. Is that right?</p> <p>21 A. That's right. They are municipal and</p> <p>22 district boundaries.</p> <p>23 Q. And I think you say here, in heading D,</p> <p>24 "Charleston County split erratically."</p> <p>25 A. That's right.</p>

27 (Pages 102 - 105)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

Page 106	Page 108
<p>1 Q. And you talk about Summerville, Ladson, 2 I hope that's how you say that, and North Charleston 3 are split in the enacted plan. Is that right? 4 A. The state has split all three cities. 5 Correct. 6 Q. And all three of these cities are 7 located in more than one county. Isn't that right? 8 A. That's right. That's what it says in 9 the previous sentence. 10 Q. So keeping these cities whole would 11 require splitting counties, wouldn't it? 12 A. That's right. You have a tradeoff here 13 between counties and cities. 14 Q. And do you know, one way or the other, 15 whether the district line in these cities deviates 16 from the county line? 17 A. This picture doesn't tell us that, but 18 I'm -- well, I will just say that, this picture 19 doesn't tell us that. 20 Q. Okay. Let's move to 5.2, which is 21 District 2 -- 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. -- on page 18 of your report. And you 24 mention that Orangeburg is separated from CD 2. 25 A. Uh-huh.</p>	<p>1 around which the hook wraps, has an incumbent 2 address in it. 3 Q. Do you know which incumbent? 4 A. I think that would be our District 6 5 incumbent, which is Clyburn. 6 Q. Turn to page 19. Again, Figure 7, are 7 the red lines municipal boundaries and the black 8 lines district boundaries? 9 A. That's right. 10 Q. And in C you mention splitting in and 11 around Columbia. 12 A. That's right. 13 Q. You mention Cayce, Columbia and Forest 14 Acres. Do you know whether any of these splits were 15 present in the benchmark plan? 16 A. I don't. I'm not going to -- 17 unfortunately, I'm not going to be able to answer 18 any of those kinds of questions about the benchmark 19 plan using these materials. 20 Q. Okay. And are you aware of or do you 21 recall any public testimony supporting the splits? 22 A. Supporting the splits? I do not recall 23 that. Although, again, it may exist. 24 Q. Let's go to 5.3. I think you have just 25 said that you're not in a position to answer any</p>
Page 107	Page 109
<p>1 Q. And as you sit here today, do you know 2 whether Orangeburg County was split in the benchmark 3 plan? 4 A. I don't know that from these materials. 5 Q. And are you aware of any public 6 testimony supporting this split in Orangeburg 7 County? 8 A. No, although I don't discount the 9 possibility that it exists. 10 Q. Part B mentions a hook into Columbia? 11 A. Correct. 12 Q. And I think it acknowledges that this 13 hook shape did exist in the benchmark plan. Is that 14 correct? 15 A. Yes. Hang on. That's right. It says 16 that the hook shape is preserved in the new plan 17 from its non-compact hook shape in the prior plan. 18 Q. And are you aware of any public 19 testimony supporting this hook into Columbia? 20 A. I am not, but I don't discount the 21 possibility that it was discussed. 22 Q. And are you aware of any other reason 23 for this hook into Columbia? 24 A. Well, I mean, incumbent addresses comes 25 to mind. I believe that this district, the bulb</p>	<p>1 questions about the benchmark plan. Is that right? 2 A. Some questions. You know, the ones -- 3 the ones I have written about. 4 Q. The specific ones. 5 A. Right. 6 Q. Okay. Then I will not bother asking you 7 those questions. You mention here, on 20, heading 8 A), "Sumter COI not respected." 9 A. Correct. 10 Q. And are you aware of any public 11 testimony supporting these splits that you describe 12 in this paragraph? 13 A. Supporting these splits, no, I am not 14 aware of that, although it may exist. 15 Q. And are you aware of any other reason 16 for these splits? 17 A. Of Sumter. Correct? 18 Q. Correct. 19 A. No. But it may exist. 20 Q. And section B) is: "Sumter split is 21 illogical." 22 A. Right. 23 Q. And you mention a precinct is split 24 along several low-density residential roads? 25 A. Yes.</p>

28 (Pages 106 - 109)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 Q. Do you recall which precinct that is?</p> <p>2 A. You mean the name of the precinct?</p> <p>3 Q. Yes.</p> <p>4 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>5 Q. And you mention that the portion of West</p> <p>6 Oakland Avenue and all of Cemetery Road appear to be</p> <p>7 in the middle of a cemetery. Is that right?</p> <p>8 A. That's right. And to clarify, the kinds</p> <p>9 of materials that I used here were like Google</p> <p>10 Street search. I can't be -- you know, that's why I</p> <p>11 use phrases like "appear to be."</p> <p>12 Q. Got it. Okay. With respect to a line</p> <p>13 that runs through a cemetery --</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. -- to the extent it runs through a</p> <p>16 cemetery, does it split any population?</p> <p>17 A. You will find, in census data, there is</p> <p>18 population in the most surprising places, rivers,</p> <p>19 cemeteries, so I can't be sure. But, in general, I</p> <p>20 would agree with what I take to be a premise that</p> <p>21 not that many people are living in cemeteries.</p> <p>22 Q. Okay. And as you sit here today, you</p> <p>23 don't know one way or the other whether on the</p> <p>24 census data this particular stretch of road is</p> <p>25 splitting any population?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 to have some opportunity to elect and breaking it</p> <p>2 into districts in a way that reduces the opportunity</p> <p>3 to elect.</p> <p>4 Q. Is cracking coterminous with vote</p> <p>5 dilution?</p> <p>6 A. No. It is one of several strategies</p> <p>7 that are considered to be constitutive of vote</p> <p>8 dilution.</p> <p>9 Q. And in this section of your report when</p> <p>10 you're referring -- when you use the term</p> <p>11 "cracking," does that necessarily involve vote</p> <p>12 dilution?</p> <p>13 A. To make sure I understand, you're asking</p> <p>14 is it possible to imagine a scenario in which there</p> <p>15 is cracking but no vote dilution? Am I</p> <p>16 understanding right?</p> <p>17 Q. Go ahead and answer that question, and</p> <p>18 then I would like to know what you were doing in</p> <p>19 your report. But yes, please.</p> <p>20 A. Right. In this report I'm</p> <p>21 investigating -- in this section of this report I'm</p> <p>22 investigating the possibility of cracking as a means</p> <p>23 to dilute the vote or with the result of diluting</p> <p>24 the vote.</p> <p>25 Q. So is it possible to have cracking</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 A. No, I do not.</p> <p>2 Q. And again, are you aware of any public</p> <p>3 testimony supporting this split?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. All right. Let's move on to section 6.</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. This is called: "Vote dilution compared</p> <p>8 to the neutral baseline." What standard did you</p> <p>9 apply to determine whether the enacted plan dilutes</p> <p>10 Black voting power?</p> <p>11 A. So the investigation here is into what</p> <p>12 is informally called "cracking," which I can define</p> <p>13 if you would like. And the way that that was</p> <p>14 carried out is with a collection of figures that</p> <p>15 show how Black population is distributed compared to</p> <p>16 an ensemble of maps that were made with mutual</p> <p>17 criteria.</p> <p>18 Q. And I believe this section is titled:</p> <p>19 "Vote dilution"?</p> <p>20 A. That's right.</p> <p>21 Q. So can you tell me what you mean by</p> <p>22 "vote dilution"?</p> <p>23 A. So generally, I'm speaking about, as I</p> <p>24 said a moment ago, what is called cracking, which</p> <p>25 involves taking a population that's numerous enough</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 without vote dilution?</p> <p>2 A. I don't think you would call it</p> <p>3 cracking. I mean, it is possible to split a</p> <p>4 population without vote dilution, for instance, if</p> <p>5 that population does not vote cohesively. But I</p> <p>6 don't think, in general, people would use the term</p> <p>7 "cracking" in such an instance. So I think the</p> <p>8 weight of the term cracking, as actually employed,</p> <p>9 is a subcategory of dilutive tactics.</p> <p>10 Q. Here, in section 6, did you apply the</p> <p>11 Gingles analysis to determine whether vote dilution</p> <p>12 was present?</p> <p>13 A. There is no Gingles analysis here. That</p> <p>14 is, to be clear, what I mean by that, there is no</p> <p>15 Gingles 1 which is a demonstrative map that</p> <p>16 illustrates certain possibilities. And I did not</p> <p>17 conduct Gingles 2 and 3, which are analyses of</p> <p>18 racially polarized voting.</p> <p>19 Q. What's the standard of vote dilution or</p> <p>20 definition of vote dilution that you're applying</p> <p>21 here in section 6?</p> <p>22 A. I will try to quote back what I said a</p> <p>23 moment ago, but at a minimum it will be a</p> <p>24 paraphrase. So I'm examining cracking. And by</p> <p>25 "cracking" I mean is a population that could have</p>

29 (Pages 110 - 113)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 been numerous enough to have electoral opportunity</p> <p>2 divided in such a way that diminishes their</p> <p>3 electoral opportunity.</p> <p>4 Q. How do you define "electoral</p> <p>5 opportunity"?</p> <p>6 A. So I investigate that further and</p> <p>7 clarify my working definition in the next section</p> <p>8 which is called: "Electoral opportunity for Black</p> <p>9 voters." But broadly speaking, it is being arranged</p> <p>10 across districts in such a way that the groups</p> <p>11 preferred candidates, or candidates of choice may,</p> <p>12 with reasonable likelihood, prevail in elections.</p> <p>13 Q. Does your definition of "electoral</p> <p>14 opportunity" require a majority BVAP district?</p> <p>15 A. Definitely not.</p> <p>16 Q. What BVAP level does your definition of</p> <p>17 electoral opportunity require?</p> <p>18 A. I frequently have written about this.</p> <p>19 And I emphasize that it is a mistake to connect</p> <p>20 electoral opportunity with a target percentage of</p> <p>21 the demographic. And that is because of voting</p> <p>22 patterns that sometimes have different levels of</p> <p>23 support for the Black candidate of choice, for</p> <p>24 example, among White voters. So it could easily</p> <p>25 depend which White voters are in a district, not</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 A. Okay. Good. Just checking.</p> <p>2 Q. Yeah, that's okay. I think you said --</p> <p>3 so electoral opportunity for a particular minority</p> <p>4 group, let's say Black voters in South Carolina, and</p> <p>5 I think you said that your definition of electoral</p> <p>6 opportunity contemplates involvement of crossover</p> <p>7 voting. Is that right?</p> <p>8 A. It allows for the possibility of</p> <p>9 crossover voting. To be clear, here, crossover</p> <p>10 voting means the possibility that both Black voters</p> <p>11 may not support the general Black candidate of</p> <p>12 choice and the possibility that non-Black voters</p> <p>13 may, nonetheless, support the Black candidate of</p> <p>14 choice.</p> <p>15 Q. Thank you. And the second part of that</p> <p>16 is what I want to go over for just a second. So,</p> <p>17 for example, in your definition does -- a district</p> <p>18 that has had a BVAP level of 20 percent but an</p> <p>19 additional 35 percent of the district of White</p> <p>20 residents vote for the Black preferred candidate,</p> <p>21 does that district represent an electoral</p> <p>22 opportunity for the Black voters?</p> <p>23 A. I understand your question, I think. So</p> <p>24 that is, whether that would count as a district that</p> <p>25 would be -- sorry, but just -- I'm going to do a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 just how many.</p> <p>2 Q. So does your definition of electoral</p> <p>3 opportunity then contemplate crossover voting?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. So you would view a -- would you view a</p> <p>6 district that is providing an electoral opportunity</p> <p>7 if the minority group can elect its candidate of</p> <p>8 choice only in combination with certain White</p> <p>9 voters?</p> <p>10 A. Well, I would like to emphasize that I</p> <p>11 am -- the terminology that I use overlaps</p> <p>12 substantially with the terminology used by courts.</p> <p>13 But I would like to emphasize again, as I said</p> <p>14 earlier, that I'm resisting making legal</p> <p>15 conclusions. And so when I use the term "electoral</p> <p>16 opportunity" I mean what I said a moment ago, which</p> <p>17 is the creation of a district in which candidates of</p> <p>18 choice have a realistic chance of being elected.</p> <p>19 Q. Right. And thank you. I'm trying to</p> <p>20 unpack that a little bit because you are using</p> <p>21 terminology that's similar to court terminology, and</p> <p>22 I'm trying to understand if there are conceptual</p> <p>23 differences in how you concede electoral</p> <p>24 opportunity. And I don't think I was intending to</p> <p>25 ask a legal question, so let me try it again.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p> <p>1 little bit more of this qualifying language.</p> <p>2 Whether that would be considered by a court as a</p> <p>3 remedial district is not a matter I am opining on.</p> <p>4 But my definition of electoral opportunity has to do</p> <p>5 with electoral history and, in particular, it has to</p> <p>6 do with whether identified Black candidates of</p> <p>7 choice fared well in their elections if you look at</p> <p>8 the precincts that make up a particular district.</p> <p>9 So this definition does not have a role</p> <p>10 for BVAP within it. It is certainly possible -- if</p> <p>11 one wants to develop this definition in order to</p> <p>12 better fit the requirements of a court, it's</p> <p>13 certainly possible to take the Black population</p> <p>14 level into account separately, as I have done in</p> <p>15 some of my published work. In this report I look</p> <p>16 only at the electoral history.</p> <p>17 Q. Got it. Okay. That's helpful. I want</p> <p>18 to understand the implications of your definition of</p> <p>19 electoral opportunity. Because your definition</p> <p>20 doesn't examine or require a particular BVAP level,</p> <p>21 is it possible to have districts that provide an</p> <p>22 electoral opportunity at, say, a 20 percent BVAP</p> <p>23 level, not because you're examining that but just</p> <p>24 because that happens to be an opportunity district,</p> <p>25 under your definition?</p>

30 (Pages 114 - 117)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 A. It's theoretically possible.</p> <p>2 Q. And so your definition of "electoral</p> <p>3 opportunity" is not the Gingles requirements or the</p> <p>4 Gingles definition of vote dilution under section</p> <p>5 II. Is that right?</p> <p>6 A. That's right. This is not intended to</p> <p>7 be a section II inquiry.</p> <p>8 Q. And I think you said that you defined</p> <p>9 electoral opportunity as an arrangement under which</p> <p>10 the groups' preferred candidates has, I think, a</p> <p>11 reasonable opportunity to be elected, is that right,</p> <p>12 or something along those lines?</p> <p>13 A. I think I said a realistic opportunity,</p> <p>14 but --</p> <p>15 Q. Realistic. Yeah. And I'm not trying to</p> <p>16 put words in your mouth. I want to use your</p> <p>17 phraseology. How would you define a "realistic</p> <p>18 opportunity"?</p> <p>19 A. Well, what I have done here is I have</p> <p>20 taken four elections that were identified as</p> <p>21 probative by counsel, as I say very clearly in our</p> <p>22 report, and identified these four Black candidates</p> <p>23 of choice, Whittenburg, Glenn, Harrison and the</p> <p>24 Biden/Harris ticket. And in order to assess whether</p> <p>25 such a candidate, a similar candidate would have a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 don't know that anyone else would have constructed</p> <p>2 the definition in exactly the same way, but I think</p> <p>3 this kind of analysis, which sometimes goes by the</p> <p>4 name of "reinstated election analysis," is</p> <p>5 entirely standard in the field.</p> <p>6 Q. Let's take it away from South Carolina</p> <p>7 for a moment. Reconstituted election analysis, you</p> <p>8 say is common in other places or as a general matter</p> <p>9 in redistricting or other voting rights analysis.</p> <p>10 Is that right?</p> <p>11 A. That's right.</p> <p>12 Q. And within that reconstituted election</p> <p>13 analysis is there a definition or a standard to</p> <p>14 determine realistic opportunity for a group to elect</p> <p>15 its preferred candidate?</p> <p>16 A. I don't think that I have encountered</p> <p>17 any proposed bright line. I will add to that that</p> <p>18 there are very few bright lines in this business,</p> <p>19 although one of them is present in Gingles 1, thanks</p> <p>20 to Bartlett v Strickland, in which 50 percent was</p> <p>21 clarified as a kind of fundamental level at which</p> <p>22 there is a meaningful shift in the finding. This</p> <p>23 is, again, not a section II analysis.</p> <p>24 Q. Are you aware of any academic</p> <p>25 literature, peer-reviewed literature that has</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 reasonable opportunity to be elected, I look at the</p> <p>2 major party vote share earned by each of these</p> <p>3 candidates in the district. If they won outright,</p> <p>4 then the district does seem to be effective for</p> <p>5 candidates like them.</p> <p>6 I also, in a few places, note where they</p> <p>7 may not have won outright but got within a 5-point</p> <p>8 margin, and I see those as ones in which a similar</p> <p>9 candidate might have a realistic.</p> <p>10 Opportunity. But one thing I will add</p> <p>11 to that, just to give context, is I don't mean for</p> <p>12 that 5-point margin to be, you know, a bright line</p> <p>13 or anything very formal. It is intended to give</p> <p>14 evidence that the candidate was in contention.</p> <p>15 Q. So you believe that, just so I</p> <p>16 understand, not as a bright line, but the</p> <p>17 5 percent -- the 5-point margin defines whether</p> <p>18 there is a realistic opportunity or not?</p> <p>19 A. No, I don't propose it as a definition,</p> <p>20 just as an indication.</p> <p>21 Q. How does a map drawer know whether the</p> <p>22 map he or she has drawn provides a realistic</p> <p>23 opportunity, under your definition?</p> <p>24 A. Well, my specific definition, which</p> <p>25 involves using these four particular elections -- I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 adopted or discussed your definition of electoral</p> <p>2 opportunity?</p> <p>3 A. Yes. The idea that electoral</p> <p>4 opportunity can be gauged by selecting probative</p> <p>5 elections and doing -- I don't personally love the</p> <p>6 term "reconstituted," but I recognize that others</p> <p>7 use that term. So reconstituted election analysis</p> <p>8 on probative elections, yes, absolutely, that's</p> <p>9 throughout the peer-reviewed literature.</p> <p>10 Q. Well, what about this concept of</p> <p>11 realistic possibility, I think is what you said, is</p> <p>12 that --</p> <p>13 A. I think people discuss realistic</p> <p>14 opportunity throughout the peer-reviewed literature.</p> <p>15 And just to give you some other phrases that are</p> <p>16 sometimes used in connection with that concept, in</p> <p>17 the law, the suggestion that groups should have to,</p> <p>18 so-called, pull, haul and trade in order to get</p> <p>19 their preferred candidates elected, that's a phrase</p> <p>20 that you hear echoed many times.</p> <p>21 The idea that candidates might get close</p> <p>22 and that would give an indication they could have</p> <p>23 prevailed, that is, again, a really widespread</p> <p>24 notion in both litigation and in the peer-reviewed</p> <p>25 literature.</p>

31 (Pages 118 - 121)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 122	<p>1 And in my own writing I have frequently</p> <p>2 talked about the relevance of candidates having been</p> <p>3 close to a majority of the two-way vote. I can cite</p> <p>4 several papers where I have written about that.</p> <p>5 Q. I'm trying to understand this in a</p> <p>6 little bit more practical terms. If I were advising</p> <p>7 a map drawer to draw maps that have realistic</p> <p>8 possibility or probability of election in order to</p> <p>9 guarantee electoral opportunity, what would I tell</p> <p>10 map the drawer to do?</p> <p>11 A. Well, I think that's not a cut-and-dried</p> <p>12 question. And I could certainly imagine telling a</p> <p>13 map drawer to draw districts where previous</p> <p>14 candidates would have prevailed. I can imagine</p> <p>15 telling a map drawer to draw districts where they</p> <p>16 would have prevailed comfortably, or I could imagine</p> <p>17 instructing a map drawer to draw districts where</p> <p>18 they would have been close. All of those seem like</p> <p>19 reasonable sets of instructions.</p> <p>20 Q. But under your definition it's not</p> <p>21 necessary to draw a district in which the</p> <p>22 minority-preferred candidate necessarily will</p> <p>23 prevail.</p> <p>24 A. Necessarily will prevail, definitely</p> <p>25 not. I don't even think that's possible.</p>	Page 124	<p>1 standard.</p> <p>2 Q. And this section is titled: "Vote</p> <p>3 dilution."</p> <p>4 A. Section 7?</p> <p>5 Q. Section 6. I'm sorry. Section 6 on the</p> <p>6 screen here, which is on page 22.</p> <p>7 A. Yes. It's "Vote dilution compared to</p> <p>8 the neutral baseline."</p> <p>9 Q. And I may have already asked this, but</p> <p>10 I'm not sure I'm clear on the answer. How do you</p> <p>11 define "vote dilution"?</p> <p>12 A. I haven't offered a definition of vote</p> <p>13 dilution, you know, in its entirety, but I have</p> <p>14 discussed a variety of vote dilution, which is</p> <p>15 called "cracking." And I can redefine that, but I</p> <p>16 think I have tried already twice to give a</p> <p>17 definition of cracking. And that's what I mean here</p> <p>18 as an instance of vote dilution. So when I say,</p> <p>19 "Vote dilution compared to the neutral baseline," I</p> <p>20 could equally have titled this section "Cracking</p> <p>21 compared to the neutral baseline."</p> <p>22 Q. What is the neutral baseline you used</p> <p>23 here in section 6?</p> <p>24 A. Okay. I used Python tools to build what</p> <p>25 I call ensembles, which are just collections of</p>
Page 123	<p>1 Q. You don't think there are districts in</p> <p>2 which a minority candidate necessarily will prevail?</p> <p>3 A. In the business of voting, I don't mean</p> <p>4 this glibly at all, but almost nothing is</p> <p>5 guaranteed. So you can draw very high-probability</p> <p>6 districts, but I think certainty is illusive when it</p> <p>7 comes to voting.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. Well, what about District 6 in</p> <p>9 South Carolina, is that a high probability? How</p> <p>10 would you define the probability of Congressman</p> <p>11 Clyburn prevailing in District 6?</p> <p>12 A. Well, I frequently say that I'm not in</p> <p>13 the business of making election predictions. I do a</p> <p>14 lot of modeling, and I would describe that as a</p> <p>15 district that looks effective from the point of view</p> <p>16 of the analysis presented here. It looks quite</p> <p>17 effective.</p> <p>18 Q. To your knowledge, has any court adopted</p> <p>19 your definition of "electoral opportunity"?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. I would say broadly. I mean, of</p> <p>21 course, no court has adopted a definition that takes</p> <p>22 these four particular elections. And so when you</p> <p>23 say "your definition," there is room for a range of</p> <p>24 specificity. But I think, to a reasonable degree of</p> <p>25 specificity, yes, I'm describing something entirely</p>	Page 125	<p>1 alternative districting plans that operationalize</p> <p>2 the rules as I understand them.</p> <p>3 Q. Has the ensemble method been accepted by</p> <p>4 any court in a racial gerrymandering case?</p> <p>5 A. I could not answer authoritatively</p> <p>6 whether any court has accepted ensembles in a racial</p> <p>7 gerrymandering context, but I have been involved, as</p> <p>8 I mentioned before, in numerous cases in the cycle</p> <p>9 in which ensemble evidence was used, including in a</p> <p>10 racial fairness context.</p> <p>11 Q. So as I understand the ensemble method,</p> <p>12 you program an algorithm to consider certain rules,</p> <p>13 and then the algorithm generates plans based upon</p> <p>14 those rules. Is that right?</p> <p>15 A. Yes, that's right, broadly.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. I would like to understand a</p> <p>17 little bit better what you program the algorithm to</p> <p>18 do.</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. So I think we are on page 22 here.</p> <p>21 A. Sure.</p> <p>22 Q. First you say: "Population balance and</p> <p>23 contiguity are enforced throughout the algorithm?"</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. What standard of population balance did</p>

32 (Pages 122 - 125)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 you use?</p> <p>2 A. This is described in a bit more detail</p> <p>3 on page 29 where I explain that I compared runs with</p> <p>4 a population deviation of 2 percent, 1 percent and</p> <p>5 half a percent. There is a supplementary kind of</p> <p>6 analysis that helps to increase my confidence that</p> <p>7 the population balance enforced by the algorithm is</p> <p>8 appropriate to the problem at hand, and that is to</p> <p>9 experiment with tuning those plans from the ensemble</p> <p>10 to one-person deviation. So should I describe that?</p> <p>11 Q. Please.</p> <p>12 A. I don't want to give any more details</p> <p>13 than you want, because I know I can get away into</p> <p>14 the weeds on this.</p> <p>15 Q. Please go ahead.</p> <p>16 A. Sure. Okay. So I have two kinds of</p> <p>17 tuning protocols that I use to convince myself that</p> <p>18 in a particular redistricting setting a 1 percent,</p> <p>19 say, deviation is adequate to understand</p> <p>20 Congressional redistricting in which, as we have</p> <p>21 already discussed, the usual standard for adoption</p> <p>22 is a one-person deviation.</p> <p>23 So I have done -- I routinely do two</p> <p>24 kinds of analysis, and did try them here in South</p> <p>25 Carolina, and those are to run an auto-tuning</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p> <p>1 understand, these 100,000 alternative plans each, or</p> <p>2 however many the total number was, were drawn with a</p> <p>3 population deviation as great as 2 percent. Is that</p> <p>4 right?</p> <p>5 A. The ones that appear in the figures are</p> <p>6 drawn with 1 percent. That's right.</p> <p>7 Q. And by "the figures," do you mean, for</p> <p>8 example, Figure 10 here on page 23?</p> <p>9 A. There are exactly three figures that use</p> <p>10 ensembles, and those are Figures 10, 11 and 12.</p> <p>11 Q. All right. Now back to page 22, I think</p> <p>12 you said the ensemble method is implemented with a</p> <p>13 presence for compactness --</p> <p>14 A. That's right.</p> <p>15 Q. -- for the preservation of counties and</p> <p>16 municipalities.</p> <p>17 A. That's right.</p> <p>18 Q. Can you tell me what you did to program</p> <p>19 these preferences in the algorithm?</p> <p>20 A. I certainly can. And here you should</p> <p>21 give me guidance as to the detail level that you</p> <p>22 like because, to me, this is a really fascinating</p> <p>23 research area. So I will try first with a high</p> <p>24 level of generality, and then just tell me how</p> <p>25 specific you would like to get.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 algorithm that swaps blocks at a small level until</p> <p>2 the population is tuned to one person, and to have a</p> <p>3 human, in this case me, hand-tune the maps to a</p> <p>4 one-person deviation. And the purpose of those</p> <p>5 tuning experiments is to boost my confidence that</p> <p>6 1 percent maps can quickly be tuned to one person</p> <p>7 without breaking any of their metric properties.</p> <p>8 That is the kind of justification that is properly</p> <p>9 done, in my view, to build ensembles at something</p> <p>10 like 1 percent deviation and to have a high</p> <p>11 confidence that they will be relevant to one-person</p> <p>12 redistricting requirements.</p> <p>13 Q. I would like to turn back now to page 22</p> <p>14 and then carry it over -- you mention several</p> <p>15 ensembles of 100,000 alternative plans each.</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. Were any of those plans drawn to a</p> <p>18 one-person, top-to-bottom deviation?</p> <p>19 A. I can't say whether that occurred in the</p> <p>20 1 percent ensembles, but I can say that I</p> <p>21 experimented with tuning selected plans from the</p> <p>22 ensembles and always found it to be quickly tunable</p> <p>23 to one person without breaking the other relevant</p> <p>24 properties.</p> <p>25 Q. And with respect to -- just so I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 Okay. The ensemble method here is</p> <p>2 conducted with what's called a "Markov chain." And</p> <p>3 Markov chains are sequences of random</p> <p>4 transformations. In this case, an innovation that</p> <p>5 my research group has introduced into the field of</p> <p>6 computational redistricting is the use of what are</p> <p>7 called "spanning trees." Spanning trees. And the</p> <p>8 process of moving from plan to plan is to fuse two</p> <p>9 districts, select a random spanning tree, cut that</p> <p>10 tree and that produces two new districts. That</p> <p>11 process has been analyzed in multiple peer-reviewed</p> <p>12 papers as one that promotes compactness. And the</p> <p>13 way that it does that is to up-weight -- so all of</p> <p>14 these Markov chain methods employ randomness. And</p> <p>15 that means they are probabilistic. These methods</p> <p>16 put a much higher probability on selecting a plan</p> <p>17 that is more compact in a metric that relates</p> <p>18 closely to the block cut edges metric that was</p> <p>19 discussed earlier. So it is not certain that you</p> <p>20 will choose a compact plan, but it is far more</p> <p>21 likely that you will choose a more compact plan.</p> <p>22 And, in fact, how much more likely it is in</p> <p>23 proportion to that compactness. That's how</p> <p>24 compactness is promoted. Is that the right level of</p> <p>25 detail?</p>

33 (Pages 126 - 129)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 Q. That's fine.</p> <p>2 How about preservation of counties and</p> <p>3 municipalities?</p> <p>4 A. That's done differently. And this is</p> <p>5 also something that I think is quite conceptually</p> <p>6 powerful. Here is how that's done. So it mentions</p> <p>7 that when you fuse two districts you then draw, at</p> <p>8 random, an object called a "spanning tree." Now,</p> <p>9 there are several randomized algorithms for choosing</p> <p>10 spanning trees. You could choose them uniformly,</p> <p>11 but an even faster and more efficient thing to do is</p> <p>12 to put random weights on the edges and then choose a</p> <p>13 minimum-weight spanning tree. Sorry to be a math</p> <p>14 professor, but that's how -- for a moment I will</p> <p>15 need to do that to explain this properly. So there</p> <p>16 is a classic algorithm to do that called "Kruskal's</p> <p>17 algorithm," which is what we use.</p> <p>18 What we do to promote the integrity of</p> <p>19 counties and cities is to put different weights on</p> <p>20 edges within a county and edges between counties.</p> <p>21 By putting a higher weight on edges within counties,</p> <p>22 we tend to probabilistically prioritize trees that</p> <p>23 stay within the county. And that means when you cut</p> <p>24 an edge of the tree it becomes far more likely that</p> <p>25 counties will be kept together.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 that's a preference with respect to other plans</p> <p>2 drawn in the ensemble plans. Is that right?</p> <p>3 A. That's right. You should imagine that</p> <p>4 there are trillions of possible plans, and each of</p> <p>5 them is being selected by the algorithm with some</p> <p>6 probability. So "preference" means a higher</p> <p>7 probability weight on plans that are more compact</p> <p>8 and split fewer counties.</p> <p>9 Q. Your next sentence says: "I performed</p> <p>10 runs which attempt to prioritize the preservation of</p> <p>11 certain communities of interest identified in public</p> <p>12 testimony and runs that did not operationalize the</p> <p>13 COI concept." Which communities of interest did you</p> <p>14 attempt to prioritize?</p> <p>15 A. That's precisely the ones shown in</p> <p>16 Figure 13 on page 30, exactly those.</p> <p>17 Q. How did you choose those communities of</p> <p>18 interest to prioritize?</p> <p>19 A. I believe we discussed that at some</p> <p>20 length before lunch.</p> <p>21 Q. Is it the same method?</p> <p>22 A. Oh, absolutely. This is -- the idea</p> <p>23 here was to make a good-faith effort to complete a</p> <p>24 thorough review of public testimony, find places</p> <p>25 frequently mentioned, try to understand the reasons</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 One thing I will add is that our method</p> <p>2 has a feature that I think is very helpful for</p> <p>3 problems for applications to redistricting, which is</p> <p>4 because this is done with a random weight, the</p> <p>5 importance placed on county preservation can be</p> <p>6 interpolated between zero and 100 percent. So if</p> <p>7 you find that full weight on county preservation</p> <p>8 goes too far and produces maps that cut way fewer</p> <p>9 counties than the ones made by people, you can dial</p> <p>10 down the weight on county preservation in order to</p> <p>11 be producing maps that are similar to the ones that</p> <p>12 were made by the decision-makers.</p> <p>13 In this case of South Carolina, we found</p> <p>14 that the number of county splits in our ensemble was</p> <p>15 comparable to some of the better maps made by</p> <p>16 people. And that's a way of telling that you</p> <p>17 haven't overshot the mark.</p> <p>18 Q. And that particular conclusion about</p> <p>19 county splits being comparable to other plans, is</p> <p>20 that anywhere in your report?</p> <p>21 A. That sentence, no. That's a standard</p> <p>22 element of the methodology which I described in</p> <p>23 peer-reviewed articles also.</p> <p>24 Q. Just so I understand, when you talk</p> <p>25 about a preference for compactness and preservation,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 people gave for citing these communities, make sure</p> <p>2 they were in line with reasons named by the State as</p> <p>3 legitimate, and recognizing this as selective to</p> <p>4 operationalize this as a working concept. Let me</p> <p>5 emphasize, when I say this, I certainly do not</p> <p>6 represent this as the only way of taking COIs into</p> <p>7 account. This is part of a robustness check that I</p> <p>8 like to perform whenever I do ensemble analysis to</p> <p>9 show that at least some effort to keep COIs whole</p> <p>10 wasn't having a wholesale distorting effect on the</p> <p>11 other measurable properties of the plans. And I can</p> <p>12 confirm that it was not.</p> <p>13 So the idea here is to have this toggle,</p> <p>14 COI toggle. Turn it on and there is one particular</p> <p>15 way. Turn it off, see if that changes the</p> <p>16 measurable properties and the plans that are</p> <p>17 relevant in Figures 10, 11 and 12. I find that it</p> <p>18 does not.</p> <p>19 Q. And when you say, "did not</p> <p>20 operationalize the COI concept," for a layperson</p> <p>21 like me does that mean turning off COI toggle, to</p> <p>22 borrow your analogy?</p> <p>23 A. That's exactly what I mean.</p> <p>24 Q. The next sentence says that: "Ensemble</p> <p>25 generation made no use of race data." Does that</p>

34 (Pages 130 - 133)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 mean that you turned off race data in the ensemble</p> <p>2 plans or something else?</p> <p>3 A. That means that the algorithm does not</p> <p>4 use the race field.</p> <p>5 I want to say something that I think is</p> <p>6 very important for reasoning about ensembles and</p> <p>7 race, which is, I think that everything else that's</p> <p>8 in the ensemble has racial factors subtly proxied.</p> <p>9 For example, the boundaries of counties and</p> <p>10 municipalities can well have an important racial</p> <p>11 history. And I don't mean to deny that at all, only</p> <p>12 to say that in this collection of ensemble runs the</p> <p>13 race field and the data was simply not used by the</p> <p>14 algorithm.</p> <p>15 Q. And the rest of that sentence says that</p> <p>16 the plans are neutral with respect to all other</p> <p>17 properties except those listed here. Does that mean</p> <p>18 the ensemble plans don't consider data on other</p> <p>19 traditional districting principles or those</p> <p>20 principles at all?</p> <p>21 A. It does mean that. And it also means</p> <p>22 something stronger, which is that the -- those of us</p> <p>23 who study computational redistricting, we think</p> <p>24 about, as I was referring to earlier, the</p> <p>25 probability distribution from which we are sampling</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 A. Can I do that here? I did look at</p> <p>2 incumbency in the South Carolina House, but I think</p> <p>3 for Congress I did not. Let me look again at the</p> <p>4 description in appendix A. I don't see incumbency</p> <p>5 described. And that means in this report I did not</p> <p>6 look at incumbencies.</p> <p>7 Q. Section 6.1 is a statewide analysis --</p> <p>8 or at least it's headed as a statewide analysis.</p> <p>9 And you say -- and I don't mean to suggest it's not.</p> <p>10 I'm just trying to be as accurate as you are, which</p> <p>11 you're setting a high standard. The first sentence</p> <p>12 says: "Using neutral ensembles of districting maps,</p> <p>13 we can compare the properties of a plan to</p> <p>14 alternative statewide plans that were made under</p> <p>15 traditional criteria." Are these alternative</p> <p>16 statewide plans that were made under traditional</p> <p>17 criteria the ensemble plans made with the parameters</p> <p>18 we have been discussing?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, that's right.</p> <p>20 Q. Or art they different? There are not</p> <p>21 any different set of plans?</p> <p>22 A. No. We just described the comparative.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. And as I understand what you have</p> <p>24 shown here, we will move here to District -- maybe</p> <p>25 to Figure 10, but I think it's also on page 22, what</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 So I'm not only saying that we didn't use a field in</p> <p>2 the data that has to do with other features, I'm</p> <p>3 also saying that I can characterize the limiting</p> <p>4 distribution and it depends only on the named</p> <p>5 features, the limiting distribution does, which is</p> <p>6 to say -- well, let me rephrase that in a way that I</p> <p>7 think is maybe clearer. If you take two plans and</p> <p>8 you ask how much more likely is it to see this than</p> <p>9 this, I can answer that quantitatively. And I know</p> <p>10 that it depends only on the things that are</p> <p>11 described here.</p> <p>12 Q. So when the algorithm is drawing the</p> <p>13 plans in the ensemble approach or in the ensemble</p> <p>14 plans does it consider preservation of cores?</p> <p>15 A. I have done that in some studies. I did</p> <p>16 not do that here.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And focusing again on what you</p> <p>18 did here for South Carolina on the Congressional</p> <p>19 plan, does the algorithm consider VTD splits?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. Because it only builds from whole</p> <p>21 VTDs. It does not split any VTDs.</p> <p>22 Q. And does it consider partisan</p> <p>23 performance in any districts?</p> <p>24 A. Certainly not.</p> <p>25 Q. How about incumbency pairing?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p>1 you're getting at here is the demographic statistics</p> <p>2 of the districts with the second highest BVAP. Is</p> <p>3 that right?</p> <p>4 A. That's correct. Let me clarify</p> <p>5 something which I had to refresh myself while I was</p> <p>6 rereading this report. In the statewide plot,</p> <p>7 that's the second highest out of seven. And in a</p> <p>8 focused area plot, it's the second highest out of</p> <p>9 four.</p> <p>10 Q. So why choose the second highest</p> <p>11 district, as opposed to all other districts or some</p> <p>12 other district?</p> <p>13 A. Because, as it says here, the complaint</p> <p>14 specifically seeks relief for the dilution of Black</p> <p>15 voters in 1, 2 and 5. I have included District 6</p> <p>16 because it connects 1, 2 and 5 geographically, but</p> <p>17 it is not being challenged or named in the</p> <p>18 complaint. That's the district with the highest</p> <p>19 BVAP, and that's why I looked at the second highest.</p> <p>20 Q. And you say, in 6.1 -- I think the third</p> <p>21 sentence says: "Cracking would tend to show up as</p> <p>22 unusual low BVAP in the second-highest district."</p> <p>23 Is there any peer-reviewed literature to support</p> <p>24 that statement?</p> <p>25 A. Sure. Let's be clear on the logic of</p>

35 (Pages 134 - 137)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 that statement. So let me try to explain the logic</p> <p>2 of that statement. So again, with apologies for</p> <p>3 repetition, cracking is taking population that could</p> <p>4 have been numerous enough to exert electoral control</p> <p>5 and distributing it in such a way that it is</p> <p>6 dispersed and does not -- the population does not</p> <p>7 have an opportunity for electoral control.</p> <p>8 So in this context -- and this is</p> <p>9 context specific, in this context cracking would</p> <p>10 mean since the highest district is not alleged to be</p> <p>11 packed or cracked, cracking would mean a depression</p> <p>12 of BVAP and potentially also crossover votes in the</p> <p>13 next district which, in this case, is the second</p> <p>14 highest. So yes, I think this is totally standard</p> <p>15 as an understanding of cracking.</p> <p>16 Q. And are you aware of any court opinions</p> <p>17 that adopt that logic when analyzing cracking or</p> <p>18 vote dilution issues?</p> <p>19 A. Sure. I couldn't name a case on the</p> <p>20 spot, but again, I really do think this is quite</p> <p>21 standard that -- to put it -- to phrase it a</p> <p>22 different way, sometimes there is packing</p> <p>23 accompanied by cracking, and sometimes there is a</p> <p>24 district that is not problematic accompanied by</p> <p>25 cracking.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 District 2.</p> <p>2 Q. And back on page 23, if I'm reading this</p> <p>3 correctly, each of these shaded boxes, does it cover</p> <p>4 a range of 1 percent BVAP or not necessarily?</p> <p>5 A. I do not remember the width of the bins.</p> <p>6 So it might be 1 percent. It's certainly in the</p> <p>7 neighborhood of 1 percent.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. And you say here that the State's</p> <p>9 plan is especially low, which I understand to be the</p> <p>10 25.4 percent number?</p> <p>11 A. Yes. Low in comparison with the</p> <p>12 histogram. That's right.</p> <p>13 Q. With the histogram. Right.</p> <p>14 A. In fact, it's in the lowest visible bar.</p> <p>15 Q. But what is the standard for determining</p> <p>16 whether a district is especially low?</p> <p>17 A. The term "especially" is not meant to be</p> <p>18 a term of art. And I think you will find that if</p> <p>19 you look at the way ensemble evidence has been</p> <p>20 interpreted, consistently, both researchers and</p> <p>21 courts have been resistant to specify a cutoff for</p> <p>22 what an outlier -- of what would constitute an</p> <p>23 outlier. But I think being in the lowest visible</p> <p>24 bar is a very good indication of being especially</p> <p>25 low.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 Here, the focus on second highest is</p> <p>2 because we are setting aside District 6. So the</p> <p>3 idea then that cracking would show up as unusually</p> <p>4 low BVAP, completely standard and accepted by</p> <p>5 courts, in my view.</p> <p>6 Q. Let's go to Figure 10, if we can, just</p> <p>7 for a moment. It's on the top of page 23. And this</p> <p>8 is a histogram. And I understand that the kind of</p> <p>9 shaded boxes are a distribution of the ensemble</p> <p>10 plans. Is that correct?</p> <p>11 A. Exactly.</p> <p>12 Q. And here the enacted plan's second</p> <p>13 highest BVAP district has a BVAP, it appears, of</p> <p>14 25.4 percent. Is that right?</p> <p>15 A. That's right. That's what it says in</p> <p>16 the key.</p> <p>17 Q. And do you recall which district that</p> <p>18 is?</p> <p>19 A. We can easily find that out.</p> <p>20 Q. Let's go back. I think it's on page 9</p> <p>21 of your report -- or page 8 maybe?</p> <p>22 A. Let's find it. 25.4, that's District 2.</p> <p>23 Actually, it's a tie between District 2 and 7. So</p> <p>24 in the statewide it could be either. But in the</p> <p>25 restriction to Districts 1, 2, 5 and 6 it would be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 Q. But as you said, there is no specific</p> <p>2 standard as to what constitutes an outlier.</p> <p>3 Correct?</p> <p>4 A. That's right. There is no universal</p> <p>5 standard.</p> <p>6 Q. And you say that the most neutral plans</p> <p>7 are at or near the 30 percent BVAP. Is that right?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, it does say that.</p> <p>9 Q. And you're referring to, kind of, the</p> <p>10 shaded boxes there that more or less anchor around</p> <p>11 .3?</p> <p>12 A. That's right. Sorry to interrupt. What</p> <p>13 you might call the bulk of the ensemble looks to be</p> <p>14 occurring at 30 percent plus or minus, you know, 5.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you happen to know what the average</p> <p>16 BVAP in the second highest BVAP district in the</p> <p>17 ensemble plans is?</p> <p>18 A. I don't have that number in front of me.</p> <p>19 Q. And it looks like the largest tranche is</p> <p>20 this tallest box here which, as we discussed, may be</p> <p>21 29 percent to 30 percent, or something in that</p> <p>22 range, because we don't -- stipulating we don't know</p> <p>23 what the range is that's being shown by that box.</p> <p>24 A. No, I do think it is 1 percent, as you</p> <p>25 said, because it looks like there are ten histogram</p>

36 (Pages 138 - 141)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 142	<p>1 bars between 30 and 40 percent. So I think</p> <p>2 1 percent is right.</p> <p>3 You're right that the highest bar is the</p> <p>4 one from 29 to 30 percent. But this is important to</p> <p>5 know if you're working with data of this kind, the</p> <p>6 location of the highest bar really depends on how</p> <p>7 fat your bins are. So if I made the bins half a</p> <p>8 percent instead of a full percent, we might have a</p> <p>9 different highest bar. It's not quite the same as</p> <p>10 what is sometimes called the "mode" in statistics,</p> <p>11 the most common value. This is binned, or</p> <p>12 aggregated data, and so the identity of the highest</p> <p>13 bar could change with the width of the bins.</p> <p>14 Q. Thank you for that clarification.</p> <p>15 So Figure 10, it has the line for the</p> <p>16 enacted plan at 25.4 percent. And it also shows the</p> <p>17 Harpootlian and NAACP1. Is that right?</p> <p>18 A. That's right.</p> <p>19 Q. And for both of those lines they are</p> <p>20 higher than that 30 percent range you identified for</p> <p>21 the neutral plans. Is that right?</p> <p>22 A. Well, I wouldn't call 30 percent a</p> <p>23 range. I would say that, you know, 30 percent, plus</p> <p>24 or minus a few percentage points, is where the bulk</p> <p>25 of this ensemble is. And I agree with you that both</p>	Page 144	<p>1 statewide is 25.4, just like District 7. And it may</p> <p>2 be identical to District 7. If you focus on</p> <p>3 Districts 1, 2, 5 and 6, as I do in some parts of</p> <p>4 the report, then the second highest is 24 percent.</p> <p>5 Q. And you said you focused on 1, 2, 5 and</p> <p>6 6 in the next portion of your report which we will</p> <p>7 get to, but in the enacted plan what's the BVAP in</p> <p>8 the second highest BVAP district among those</p> <p>9 districts?</p> <p>10 A. It's still 25.4.</p> <p>11 Q. And then the LWV plan statewide, what's</p> <p>12 the BVAP in the second highest BVAP district in that</p> <p>13 plan?</p> <p>14 A. Statewide, it looks like it's 24.5, but</p> <p>15 please correct me if I'm misreading.</p> <p>16 Q. It looks like 24.5, at least to me, so</p> <p>17 we will go with that. So in the LWV plan, the</p> <p>18 second highest BVAP district has a lower BVAP than</p> <p>19 the second highest BVAP district in the enacted</p> <p>20 plan?</p> <p>21 A. Yes.</p> <p>22 Q. And in the SC-NAACP2 plan, the second</p> <p>23 highest BVAP district has the same BVAP as the</p> <p>24 second highest BVAP district in the enacted plan?</p> <p>25 A. Correct.</p>
Page 143	<p>1 the green and the red line, which represent</p> <p>2 Harpootlian and NAACP1, are relatively high. They</p> <p>3 don't share the property with the enacted plan of</p> <p>4 being in the most extreme bar that occurred, but</p> <p>5 they are relatively high. Agreed.</p> <p>6 Q. And is there a reason why Figure 10</p> <p>7 doesn't have lines for NAACP2 or the League of Women</p> <p>8 Voters plans?</p> <p>9 A. There were eleven plans overall. And I</p> <p>10 believe I did generate a picture that had them all</p> <p>11 and it was quite cluttered, so I chose to focus on a</p> <p>12 few.</p> <p>13 Q. I would like to turn back to page 8 of</p> <p>14 your report.</p> <p>15 A. Sure.</p> <p>16 Q. Maybe it's page 9. I apologize. And I</p> <p>17 want to start with the NAACP2 plan.</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. What is the BVAP in the second highest</p> <p>20 BVAP district in that plan?</p> <p>21 A. Statewide, it is 25.4. And let me just</p> <p>22 say I'm attempting to read numbers live. I might</p> <p>23 make mistakes.</p> <p>24 Q. That's okay.</p> <p>25 A. It looks like NAACP2, the second highest</p>	Page 145	<p>1 Q. So if we return to page 23 on this</p> <p>2 histogram, the SC-NAACP2 line would be the same as</p> <p>3 the enacted plan line. Correct? It says 25.4</p> <p>4 percent.</p> <p>5 A. You're challenging my memory, but I</p> <p>6 think that's right. I think that's right.</p> <p>7 Q. And the LWV plan, because it's slightly</p> <p>8 lower, would be somewhere to the left of that line.</p> <p>9 Is that correct?</p> <p>10 A. 24, I think it was.</p> <p>11 Q. Yes, 24, as opposed to 25.4.</p> <p>12 A. That is definitely to the left.</p> <p>13 Q. So in your opinion, are those plans</p> <p>14 cracked?</p> <p>15 A. I don't think that they are. Although,</p> <p>16 let me just say, which I think is quite important,</p> <p>17 the function of this report is not to defend those</p> <p>18 plans. But I think that's important to point out.</p> <p>19 But, you know, the electoral opportunity, I'm not</p> <p>20 sure whether I evaluated it in those plans. Oh. I</p> <p>21 did. I see. I do have an effectiveness by plan</p> <p>22 table in Table 7, which I assume we will get to</p> <p>23 shortly.</p> <p>24 Q. We will.</p> <p>25 A. So it's that they have a low BVAP, but,</p>

37 (Pages 142 - 145)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 as I have emphasized, that you have to understand</p> <p>2 effectiveness in the context of which Black voters</p> <p>3 and which non-Black voters are in the districts. I</p> <p>4 do agree that they have lower or equal BVAP to the</p> <p>5 enacted plan which is, I think, what you asked.</p> <p>6 Q. Yeah. And I understood that section 6</p> <p>7 was an attempt to analyze whether cracking was</p> <p>8 present. Is that right?</p> <p>9 A. Yeah, it was an attempt to analyze the</p> <p>10 distribution of BVAP with respect to the ensemble.</p> <p>11 So I agree that those plans are pretty low.</p> <p>12 Q. Would they be especially low?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, they would be especially low</p> <p>14 compared to the ensemble. That's correct.</p> <p>15 Q. And in the ensemble plans, do any of the</p> <p>16 ensemble plans have a highest BVAP district with a</p> <p>17 BVAP lower than enacted District 6?</p> <p>18 A. Oh, boy. A highest BVAP district lower.</p> <p>19 I don't think I have got that question answered in</p> <p>20 the report. I think I always look -- I think -- but</p> <p>21 you can correct me, please, if I am mistaking</p> <p>22 something, I think I always look at the second</p> <p>23 highest, and so I don't have that set of numbers in</p> <p>24 front of me.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And as I understand the way you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 histogram, is just showing the distribution of those</p> <p>2 ensemble plans in this kind of bar chart form. Is</p> <p>3 that right?</p> <p>4 A. That's right. It's a new set of 100,000</p> <p>5 plans.</p> <p>6 Q. And it looks like the majority of</p> <p>7 ensemble plans in this focused area ensemble have a</p> <p>8 second highest BVAP district of less than</p> <p>9 30 percent. Is that right?</p> <p>10 A. I agree that to my eye it looks like</p> <p>11 more than half the mass is to the left of</p> <p>12 30 percent.</p> <p>13 Q. And these were drawn with the same</p> <p>14 criteria --</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. -- that we discussed before for the</p> <p>17 other set of ensemble maps. Is that correct?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, they were.</p> <p>19 MR. GORE: So I'm about to move into</p> <p>20 section 7. We have been going for just about an</p> <p>21 hour on the nose. Would anybody like to take a</p> <p>22 break?</p> <p>23 (Break In Proceedings)</p> <p>24 MR. GORE: So let's go back on the</p> <p>25 record.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 programmed the algorithm, the algorithm did not</p> <p>2 require that the plan be drawn with a district that</p> <p>3 has a BVAP as high as enacted District 6, right,</p> <p>4 because you didn't direct it to consider race at</p> <p>5 all?</p> <p>6 A. That's correct.</p> <p>7 Q. All right. Let's go to the "Focused</p> <p>8 area" in 6.2.</p> <p>9 A. Yes.</p> <p>10 Q. And I just want to confirm that all of</p> <p>11 the -- the first thing I want to confirm is that the</p> <p>12 plans you discuss here are ensemble plans from the</p> <p>13 set of ensemble plans we have already been</p> <p>14 discussing, subject to the same parameters we have</p> <p>15 already discussed.</p> <p>16 A. No. It's a new ensemble, but with the</p> <p>17 same parameters. The difference is which districts</p> <p>18 are being scrambled. In the statewide, in 6.1 all</p> <p>19 seven districts are being scrambled and redrawn. In</p> <p>20 6.2 the same principles are used, but only four of</p> <p>21 the districts are being altered.</p> <p>22 Q. Got it. And those districts are 1, 2, 5</p> <p>23 and 6. Is that right?</p> <p>24 A. That's correct.</p> <p>25 Q. And again, this Figure 11, the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>2 Q. Dr. Duchin, did you discuss your</p> <p>3 testimony or deposition with anyone during the</p> <p>4 break?</p> <p>5 A. I did not.</p> <p>6 Q. I want to ask one more question about</p> <p>7 section 6 before I move on to section 7.</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. In section 6, back on page 22 you</p> <p>10 identified some of the other principles that you</p> <p>11 used to program the algorithm that generated the</p> <p>12 ensemble map. And you noted a preference for</p> <p>13 compactness and for the preservation of counties and</p> <p>14 municipalities.</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. Does your report contain any analysis of</p> <p>17 how the enacted plan compares to the ensemble plans</p> <p>18 with respect to those criteria?</p> <p>19 A. No, it's not in my report, but it could</p> <p>20 be derived from the outposts.</p> <p>21 Q. Thank you. All right. Let's move to</p> <p>22 section 7. We talked a little bit about minority</p> <p>23 opportunity during your deposition. Do you know how</p> <p>24 counsel identified these races that are shown here</p> <p>25 on page 25?</p>

38 (Pages 146 - 149)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 150	<p>1 A. My understanding is that they were</p> <p>2 derived from the expert work of Baodong Liu who was</p> <p>3 the Gingle -- let's just say the racially polarized</p> <p>4 voting expert in the case. I suppose it's not</p> <p>5 Gingles. So I think these come from Liu's RPV</p> <p>6 analysis.</p> <p>7 Q. And you didn't conduct any independent</p> <p>8 RPV analysis. Correct?</p> <p>9 A. I did not in South Carolina, although I</p> <p>10 frequently do, and I understand the methodology</p> <p>11 well.</p> <p>12 Q. And under Table 6 it says: "Black</p> <p>13 candidates of choice were identified in a racially</p> <p>14 polarized voting analysis provided by counsel." So</p> <p>15 what is the racially polarized voting analysis that</p> <p>16 counsel provided?</p> <p>17 A. I see. The wording in here might be a</p> <p>18 little bit confusing. What I was provided with is</p> <p>19 this list of four races. It is my understanding</p> <p>20 that they were extracted from a racially polarized</p> <p>21 voting analysis, but I did not read Baodong's</p> <p>22 report.</p> <p>23 Q. And you didn't read any other racially</p> <p>24 polarized voting analysis for this case -- or for</p> <p>25 this report, anyway?</p>	Page 152	<p>1 in saying that Table 7 shouldn't be interpreted as</p> <p>2 democratic performance because it's the performance</p> <p>3 of these four particular Democrats.</p> <p>4 Q. Certainly. And are these four</p> <p>5 candidates the only Black candidates of choice in</p> <p>6 South Carolina electoral history?</p> <p>7 A. No, they are not.</p> <p>8 Q. Okay. So you have four elections. And</p> <p>9 you have identified -- or had identified for you</p> <p>10 four Black candidates of choice. And in each of</p> <p>11 those four elections those candidates are Democrats.</p> <p>12 Right?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, these were four or five. I mean,</p> <p>14 Joe Biden and Kamala Harris being on one ticket but</p> <p>15 different people.</p> <p>16 Q. So maybe we will refer to them as</p> <p>17 tickets, just to be precise. Table 7 records the</p> <p>18 number of times any of these candidates won in each</p> <p>19 district in each of the plans listed here. Correct?</p> <p>20 A. Right. And just to be perfectly clear,</p> <p>21 one means that they had more votes than their major</p> <p>22 party opponent, in this case a Republican. So it</p> <p>23 does not take third-party votes into account. So</p> <p>24 it's the plurality winner, essentially.</p> <p>25 Q. Thank you. And thank you for that</p>
Page 151	<p>1 A. I did not. I took these at face value</p> <p>2 as the probative elections to consider.</p> <p>3 Q. And are any of these congressional</p> <p>4 elections?</p> <p>5 A. No. These are all statewide elections,</p> <p>6 which is important for an ensemble analysis.</p> <p>7 Q. And, generally, these would be exogenous</p> <p>8 elections when analyzing congressional results. Is</p> <p>9 that right?</p> <p>10 A. Correct. That term usually means they</p> <p>11 are from a different contest. And these being</p> <p>12 statewide races are exogenous for Congressional</p> <p>13 analysis.</p> <p>14 Q. Was the Black candidate of choice in</p> <p>15 each of these elections a Democrat?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, that's my understanding.</p> <p>17 Q. And so if we look down to Table 7, is</p> <p>18 another way to look at your charts is how often the</p> <p>19 democratic candidate won. Correct?</p> <p>20 A. Well, these democratic candidates. By</p> <p>21 contrast, in Figure 12, I compared these candidates</p> <p>22 to the other democratic candidates.</p> <p>23 Q. Certainly. We will go get to Figure 12.</p> <p>24 For now I'm just asking about Table 7.</p> <p>25 A. Right. I was attempting to answer that</p>	Page 153	<p>1 clarification. So each of these quote/unquote wins</p> <p>2 is the Black preferred candidate, who is also a</p> <p>3 democrat, prevailing in the two-party vote. Is that</p> <p>4 correct?</p> <p>5 A. That is correct.</p> <p>6 Q. So take the enacted plan, for example,</p> <p>7 it lists four wins in District 6.</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. And each of those wins is for a Black</p> <p>10 preferred candidate. Correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And each is also for a Democrat.</p> <p>13 Correct?</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. And in your experience have you ever</p> <p>16 seen a case or scenario where the Black preferred</p> <p>17 candidate was not a democrat?</p> <p>18 A. I'm thinking. In a recent electoral</p> <p>19 history in statewide elections, that is in elections</p> <p>20 with a party ID, at the moment Black preferred</p> <p>21 candidates do strongly tend to be Democrats</p> <p>22 nationwide. That's not necessarily true for other</p> <p>23 minority groups. Are there exceptions? Well, it is</p> <p>24 definitely the case that ecological inference</p> <p>25 methods, which are usually what underpin RPV</p>

39 (Pages 150 - 153)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 154</p> <p>1 analysis, show areas of the country in which Black</p> <p>2 voters have preferred Republicans at times. But in</p> <p>3 the studies that I personally have conducted I have</p> <p>4 not seen that, at least with any frequency.</p> <p>5 Q. And so according to Table 7, enacted</p> <p>6 2022 and previous 2012 which I have been calling the</p> <p>7 benchmark plan, each have four wins in District 6.</p> <p>8 Right?</p> <p>9 A. That's correct.</p> <p>10 Q. And I'm going to flip back to page 24 --</p> <p>11 23 and 24. You identified an alternative districts</p> <p>12 plan here.</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. And do you know how many wins these</p> <p>15 districts generated?</p> <p>16 A. I do. It's described in the footnote.</p> <p>17 Q. I see it. Okay.</p> <p>18 A. And the footnote says that the candidate</p> <p>19 of choice won outright in one of the four contests</p> <p>20 and received at least 47.5 percent of the vote; i.e.</p> <p>21 they were in that 5 percent margin in the other</p> <p>22 three.</p> <p>23 Q. So that would be a total of five wins.</p> <p>24 Is that right?</p> <p>25 A. Out of four? No.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 156</p> <p>1 So, in other words, the fact that it strengthened is</p> <p>2 because the percentages for the Black candidates of</p> <p>3 choice are higher. That is the basis of the claim</p> <p>4 that it strengthened. And the fact that -- sorry.</p> <p>5 Which candidate would likely have to campaign in a</p> <p>6 way that led to some Black support in order to</p> <p>7 prevail, right. So I see that those high</p> <p>8 percentages tell me the Black supporters have</p> <p>9 considerable electoral influence, which is what</p> <p>10 supports the statement that candidates would need</p> <p>11 some Black support in order to prevail.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you know what the BVAP is in this</p> <p>13 alternative CD 5?</p> <p>14 A. Good question. Let's see if I recorded</p> <p>15 it. Yes. It seems to be 30.3 percent. I think</p> <p>16 that is what -- yeah, I think that is the correct</p> <p>17 way to understand the Figure -- the histogram in</p> <p>18 Figure 11.</p> <p>19 Q. So a candidate could prevail in that</p> <p>20 district without a single Black vote. Correct?</p> <p>21 A. A candidate -- theoretically, for sure.</p> <p>22 But under the electoral numbers that I saw in the</p> <p>23 election history, I consider that to be quite</p> <p>24 unlikely.</p> <p>25 Q. Why did you consider that to be</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 155</p> <p>1 Q. If we were to -- if that had been -- if</p> <p>2 that plan had been listed here on Table 7, how many</p> <p>3 wins would we be talking about?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, I agree, in this table that would</p> <p>5 show up as a 5.</p> <p>6 Q. I was making an assumption, because I</p> <p>7 believe in the alternative plan that we are talking</p> <p>8 about District 6 is either identical or</p> <p>9 substantially similar to enacted District 6. Is</p> <p>10 that right?</p> <p>11 A. It's virtually identical.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. So I was drawing the assumption</p> <p>13 that that counted for four wins right there.</p> <p>14 A. Yes. You are correct.</p> <p>15 Q. And you say there is one more in</p> <p>16 District 5, for a total of five.</p> <p>17 A. Agreed.</p> <p>18 Q. And I want to go back to that footnote</p> <p>19 8, last sentence where you say: "That performance</p> <p>20 corroborates the claim that this is a strengthened</p> <p>21 district for Black voters, and one in which a</p> <p>22 candidate would likely have to campaign in a way</p> <p>23 that led to some Black support in order to prevail."</p> <p>24 What analysis did you do to support this statement?</p> <p>25 A. It's supported by the previous sentence.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 157</p> <p>1 unlikely?</p> <p>2 A. Because the combination, as we keep</p> <p>3 discussing, of the votes of Black voters and of the</p> <p>4 crossover votes that align with Black voters is very</p> <p>5 strong in this district.</p> <p>6 Q. I guess I'm confused. How does that</p> <p>7 square with the statement that the -- or the</p> <p>8 assumption that voting in these elections was</p> <p>9 racially polarized?</p> <p>10 A. You mean how is it possible to have</p> <p>11 racial polarization and also have crossover support</p> <p>12 for Black candidates of choice? Is that the</p> <p>13 question?</p> <p>14 Q. Sure.</p> <p>15 A. Oh, sure. For example, you could</p> <p>16 imagine a scenario where 75 percent of non-Black</p> <p>17 voters do not support the Black candidate of choice.</p> <p>18 That would be considered racially polarized</p> <p>19 frequently by standards that I have seen in court.</p> <p>20 But that still leaves 25 percent of the non-Black</p> <p>21 electorate that can cross over and align with the</p> <p>22 candidate of choice. And depending on how you draw</p> <p>23 your district, you might capture just such voters,</p> <p>24 crossover voters. Does that answer your question?</p> <p>25 Q. Thank you. Yes.</p>

40 (Pages 154 - 157)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 158</p> <p>1 So back to footnote 8 on page 23, other</p> <p>2 than looking at the results of these four elections,</p> <p>3 did you do any analysis to determine whether a</p> <p>4 candidate would likely have to campaign in a way</p> <p>5 that led to some Black support in order to prevail?</p> <p>6 A. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to give you</p> <p>7 the impression that there was any additional</p> <p>8 analysis. That last sentence is my interpretation</p> <p>9 of the consequence of the previous sentence. I</p> <p>10 don't represent any further research supporting</p> <p>11 that.</p> <p>12 Q. Thank you. All right. Let's go back</p> <p>13 then to Table 7.</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. Do you happen to know what percentage</p> <p>16 the vote -- the Black preferred candidate receives</p> <p>17 in other districts in the enacted plan outside of</p> <p>18 District 6?</p> <p>19 A. I don't have those numbers in front of</p> <p>20 me. I did look at those when I was doing the</p> <p>21 analysis that led to writing this section, but I</p> <p>22 don't have those numbers in front of me.</p> <p>23 Q. And correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't</p> <p>24 believe those numbers are in your report.</p> <p>25 A. No. That's correct, they are not.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 160</p> <p>1 there is significant crossover voting in that</p> <p>2 district. Correct?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. So to get to a plurality, would the</p> <p>5 Black preferred candidate need more votes from White</p> <p>6 voters than that candidate receives from Black</p> <p>7 voters?</p> <p>8 A. It depends on who votes. It doesn't</p> <p>9 follow from these numbers.</p> <p>10 Q. But it is possible, right, depending on</p> <p>11 turnout and electoral behavior and things like that?</p> <p>12 A. It's possible. I mean, turnout is far</p> <p>13 from 100 percent of voting age population, so many</p> <p>14 things are possible. It's hard to say who turns</p> <p>15 out. It's a general problem facing election</p> <p>16 analysis.</p> <p>17 Q. And can turnout vary by race?</p> <p>18 A. Yes, it can. There is an excellent book</p> <p>19 on that by Bernard Fraga, F-R-A-G-A.</p> <p>20 Q. And this District 1 with 21.2 percent</p> <p>21 BVAP, that's not the second highest BVAP district in</p> <p>22 the Harpootlian plan we discussed in section 6.</p> <p>23 Right?</p> <p>24 A. That's right. It looks like District 5</p> <p>25 is the second highest.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 159</p> <p>1 Q. All right. So let's look at this. So</p> <p>2 the Harpootlian plan in District 1 generates two</p> <p>3 wins for the Black preferred candidate. Is that</p> <p>4 right?</p> <p>5 A. That's right.</p> <p>6 Q. Who also happens to be a Democrat. Is</p> <p>7 that right?</p> <p>8 A. Yes. And these Black preferred</p> <p>9 candidates are all Democrats.</p> <p>10 Q. I want to go back to page -- and then</p> <p>11 the Harpootlian plan does not generate any other</p> <p>12 wins for Black preferred candidates in any other</p> <p>13 districts. Correct?</p> <p>14 A. That's right. Although, again, this</p> <p>15 table doesn't show you instances of getting close</p> <p>16 but it just shows you whether you cross the line to</p> <p>17 having plurality support. You're right. There are</p> <p>18 no other instances of plurality support.</p> <p>19 Q. So let's go back to page 9, if we might.</p> <p>20 A. We might.</p> <p>21 Q. And in the Harpootlian plan, what is the</p> <p>22 BVAP of District 1?</p> <p>23 A. 21.2 percent.</p> <p>24 Q. So for the Black preferred candidate to</p> <p>25 prevail in a 21.2 percent BVAP district, that means</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 161</p> <p>1 Q. And 21.2 percent BVAP district in</p> <p>2 District 1 in the Harpootlian plan also has a lower</p> <p>3 BVAP than the second highest BVAP district in the</p> <p>4 enacted plan. Right?</p> <p>5 A. Sorry. Let me unpack that. You're</p> <p>6 asking if the 21.2 is higher -- is lower than the</p> <p>7 second higher.</p> <p>8 Q. Yes. Is 21.2 lower than 25.4?</p> <p>9 A. Definitely. I do answer that.</p> <p>10 Q. That will make it easier. Sorry. It's</p> <p>11 hard to describe some of this shorthand.</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. And so according to Table 7, the</p> <p>14 Harpootlian plan performs for the minority preferred</p> <p>15 candidate in District 1 with 21.2 percent BVAP, but</p> <p>16 not in District 5 with 33.7 percent BVAP. Is that</p> <p>17 right?</p> <p>18 A. Well, let's be clear. The term</p> <p>19 "performs" is not 100 percent clear, or I don't</p> <p>20 think is language that I use, but of these Black</p> <p>21 candidates of choice there are two wins in District</p> <p>22 1 in the Harpootlian plan and no wins in District 5,</p> <p>23 despite the fact that 5 has higher BVAP. I think</p> <p>24 that was the essence of the question. Right?</p> <p>25 Q. That is the essence of the question. So</p>

41 (Pages 158 - 161)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 162</p> <p>1 District 5 has maybe 12-and-a-half-percent higher</p> <p>2 BVAP than District 1. And in District 5 there are</p> <p>3 zero wins for those four candidates and in District</p> <p>4 1 there are two wins for those four candidates.</p> <p>5 Right?</p> <p>6 A. Right. I think this completely supports</p> <p>7 the point discussed earlier, that BVAP is an</p> <p>8 imperfect proxy for electoral opportunity.</p> <p>9 Q. And does it also support the point that</p> <p>10 what is driving wins for Black preferred candidates</p> <p>11 is the presence or absence of White crossover</p> <p>12 voting?</p> <p>13 A. I wouldn't say that drives. I would say</p> <p>14 it contributes.</p> <p>15 Q. And you would say that it's a</p> <p>16 significant factor. Right?</p> <p>17 A. That White crossover voting is a</p> <p>18 significant factor in outcomes?</p> <p>19 Q. Yes.</p> <p>20 A. No question, yes, it certainly is.</p> <p>21 Q. And how significant a factor is it?</p> <p>22 A. Could you maybe rephrase the question?</p> <p>23 Q. Probably not. That was my</p> <p>24 characterization, significant factor. And so maybe</p> <p>25 we can just leave it at that --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 164</p> <p>1 directed at that question before I would feel</p> <p>2 comfortable characterizing the geography of</p> <p>3 crossover support.</p> <p>4 Q. And you have identified Charleston and</p> <p>5 Columbia as places where there is significant</p> <p>6 crossover support in South Carolina. Correct?</p> <p>7 A. I have noticed those trends in those</p> <p>8 areas, but again, I did not do, you know, a primary</p> <p>9 analysis to address that question and so I want to</p> <p>10 be careful not to overstate.</p> <p>11 Q. And thank you for that clarification.</p> <p>12 In addition to Charleston and Columbia</p> <p>13 are there any others that come to mind?</p> <p>14 A. No, there aren't, but the fact that</p> <p>15 nothing comes to mind shouldn't be taken to say that</p> <p>16 there aren't other areas. I just didn't put primary</p> <p>17 attention towards that question.</p> <p>18 Q. Let's return to page --</p> <p>19 A. Table 7.</p> <p>20 Q. It's page 25. Can you see it on my</p> <p>21 screen, by the way?</p> <p>22 A. Yes, I can.</p> <p>23 Q. Make sure that's clear for the record.</p> <p>24 So let's look at the League of Women</p> <p>25 Voters plan which is right below the Harpootlian</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 163</p> <p>1 A. I agree with significant factor.</p> <p>2 Q. -- that you agree with the significant</p> <p>3 factor.</p> <p>4 A. (Witness nods head).</p> <p>5 Q. And do you happen to know where, in</p> <p>6 South Carolina, White Democrats live?</p> <p>7 A. Well, first I would say that I resist</p> <p>8 characterizing people -- people as either Democrats</p> <p>9 or Republicans because, for example, I live in a</p> <p>10 state where people vote one way for Senate and</p> <p>11 wildly differently for governor. And so party</p> <p>12 affiliations are not immutable. But I have looked</p> <p>13 at where, in the State, it's possible to find</p> <p>14 historically effective districts, in the sense that</p> <p>15 I discuss here in section 7, that are affected</p> <p>16 despite a relatively low BVAP. I have seen places</p> <p>17 in the State, especially near Charleston and</p> <p>18 Columbia, where there are significant historical</p> <p>19 levels of crossover support.</p> <p>20 Q. And is it accurate to say, at least in</p> <p>21 South Carolina, that those areas of crossover</p> <p>22 support and crossover opportunity are concentrated</p> <p>23 in particular areas of the State, as opposed to</p> <p>24 being diffused evenly across the state?</p> <p>25 A. I would really have to do an analysis</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 165</p> <p>1 plan.</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. It has an effectiveness total of 6,</p> <p>4 which includes two wins in District 1, four wins in</p> <p>5 District 6 and no wins in any other district. Is</p> <p>6 that right?</p> <p>7 A. That's right.</p> <p>8 Q. And so if we return to page 9 and look</p> <p>9 at the BVAP in the LWV districts, it looks like it's</p> <p>10 23.3 percent in District 1.</p> <p>11 A. Agreed.</p> <p>12 Q. And that's lower than the 24.4 in</p> <p>13 District 5 and the 24.5 in District 7. Correct?</p> <p>14 A. That's right.</p> <p>15 Q. And so in the LWV plan, District 1 is</p> <p>16 not the second highest BVAP district. Is that</p> <p>17 right?</p> <p>18 A. That's right.</p> <p>19 Q. And the 23.3 percent is also lower than</p> <p>20 the 25.4 percent in enacted 2 and 7. Correct?</p> <p>21 A. Again? Sorry.</p> <p>22 Q. No problem. The 23.3 percent BVAP in</p> <p>23 LWV District 1 is lower than the 25.4 percent BVAP</p> <p>24 in enacted 2 and enacted 7. Correct?</p> <p>25 A. That's correct.</p>

42 (Pages 162 - 165)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

Page 166	Page 168
<p>1 Q. And then if we return to page 25, let's</p> <p>2 look at the SC-NAACP2 plan. It has effectiveness of</p> <p>3 eight out of 28. Four wins in District 1, two in --</p> <p>4 I'm sorry. And four in District 6. Sorry. I</p> <p>5 started reading the wrong line.</p> <p>6 A. That's all right.</p> <p>7 Q. And none in any other district.</p> <p>8 A. Correct.</p> <p>9 Q. And if we go back to page 9, the BVAP in</p> <p>10 SC-NAACP2, District 1, is 24 percent.</p> <p>11 A. It is.</p> <p>12 Q. And that's lower than 25.4 percent in</p> <p>13 District 7.</p> <p>14 A. Yes.</p> <p>15 Q. So it's also not the second-highest BVAP</p> <p>16 district in that plan.</p> <p>17 A. That's right. Would it be okay to</p> <p>18 summarize and say that it's frequently the case that</p> <p>19 District 1 performs well in effectiveness despite a</p> <p>20 lower BVAP than other nonperforming districts?</p> <p>21 Q. Yes, that would be fair. And my</p> <p>22 follow-up question is in Charleston -- and is that</p> <p>23 because of portions of Charleston that are included</p> <p>24 in District 1 where there is crossover voting?</p> <p>25 A. It's possible that those phenomena are</p>	<p>1 to stand alone as explanatory of performance. And I</p> <p>2 always, in my ratings, resist using BVAP alone as a</p> <p>3 proxy for performance. This is why I like to use</p> <p>4 electoral history. But it is a piece of the puzzle.</p> <p>5 A high BVAP correlates well with the</p> <p>6 presence of opportunity in areas with especially</p> <p>7 high polarization, and so targeting a depressed BVAP</p> <p>8 in Districts 7 and 2 relative to the neutral</p> <p>9 baseline is ensuring a reduced electoral opportunity</p> <p>10 in those areas. Now, let me be clear, there are</p> <p>11 parts of the State, as we have just reviewed, where</p> <p>12 you can overperform your BVAP. But I haven't seen</p> <p>13 evidence that it's possible in the parts of the</p> <p>14 State touched by, for example, District 2 to find a</p> <p>15 creative configuration that would allow 25 percent</p> <p>16 BVAP to coexist with meaningful electoral</p> <p>17 opportunity.</p> <p>18 So let me summarize all of what I just</p> <p>19 said. Hitting a certain target level for BVAP is</p> <p>20 neither necessary nor sufficient for electoral</p> <p>21 opportunity. You have to do both kinds of analysis.</p> <p>22 But looking at BVAP targeting can give us strong</p> <p>23 evidence of racial predominance over other</p> <p>24 considerations, and that's why I offer that as an</p> <p>25 element of the analysis but not one that is meant to</p>
Page 167	Page 169
<p>1 localized to Charleston. But what is clear is that,</p> <p>2 overall, the district contains a population that due</p> <p>3 to its voting behavior and including turnout it</p> <p>4 overperforms what you might have supposed from its</p> <p>5 BVAP alone.</p> <p>6 Q. When you were analyzing cracking and</p> <p>7 vote dilution in section 6 of your report, you</p> <p>8 focused on the second highest BVAP district.</p> <p>9 Correct?</p> <p>10 A. That's right.</p> <p>11 Q. And in the Harpootlian, LWV and</p> <p>12 SC-NAACP2 plans here in Table 7, the district that</p> <p>13 you determine is effective is not the second highest</p> <p>14 BVAP plan. Correct?</p> <p>15 A. Absolutely agreed.</p> <p>16 Q. So what does section 6 tell us about</p> <p>17 vote dilution?</p> <p>18 A. Good. Well, I'm glad you asked. So I</p> <p>19 think what it tells us is about what is being</p> <p>20 constructed across the districts around the state</p> <p>21 and so, in particular, as we understand well, from</p> <p>22 our study of voting patterns, there are some areas</p> <p>23 with higher crossover support and some areas with</p> <p>24 lower crossover support. You would never -- I think</p> <p>25 a reasonable practitioner would never expect a BVAP</p>	<p>1 be taken in a vacuum of electoral history.</p> <p>2 Q. Thank you for that explanation.</p> <p>3 Let's take enacted District 1 as an</p> <p>4 example. So enacted District 1 does not perform for</p> <p>5 the Black candidate of choice. Is that correct? Or</p> <p>6 it doesn't result in any wins for the Black</p> <p>7 candidate of choice in those four elections.</p> <p>8 Correct?</p> <p>9 A. That's right.</p> <p>10 Q. And so that means it also doesn't result</p> <p>11 in any wins for the crossover voters' candidate of</p> <p>12 choice. Correct?</p> <p>13 A. The crossover voters' candidate of</p> <p>14 choice, that's not a construction that I have heard,</p> <p>15 but I think what you mean by that is there are,</p> <p>16 let's say, White voters who support the Black</p> <p>17 candidate of choice and they also do not see their</p> <p>18 chosen candidate prevail. Is that --</p> <p>19 Q. That's exactly what I mean.</p> <p>20 A. True.</p> <p>21 Q. And, in fact, in enacted District 1, for</p> <p>22 voters who voted for the democratic candidate, their</p> <p>23 candidate of choice is not winning either. Right?</p> <p>24 A. So I think -- let me try to separate out</p> <p>25 the phrase "candidate of choice" because that is a</p>

43 (Pages 166 - 169)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 170</p> <p>1 little bit of a term of art, as I understand it, at 2 least in my areas of expertise. So "candidate of 3 choice" is the overall preference of a racial, 4 ethnic or language group. I don't think it just 5 means the candidate that you voted for. Right? And 6 so White voters' candidate of choice in South 7 Carolina is, to my understanding, always the 8 Republican in a party ID contest. But having said 9 that, just to set out the terms of discussion, 10 you're asking, I think, if White voters who voted 11 for the Democrat can prevail in a district in which 12 the Republican always wins. Am I understanding -- 13 Q. Go ahead and answer that. Yeah. 14 A. If you're a White voter who voted for a 15 Democrat but your district always goes Republican, 16 then your favorite candidate is not being elected. 17 Q. And so the way you describe that is the 18 candidate of choice or candidate for whom they 19 voted, that candidate is not prevailing. 20 A. Right. Any voter who voted for a 21 Democrat is not seeing their preferred candidate 22 elected in a district that always elects 23 Republicans. 24 Q. And that's true, regardless of the race 25 of that voter. Correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 172</p> <p>1 instances in which the Democratic candidate won. Is 2 that right? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. And if we go to page 27, it looks like 5 these elections are listed on page 27. 6 A. Let's see. 7 Q. In the second full paragraph which 8 starts "This finding"? 9 A. That's right. Seven more general 10 elections are evaluated, and I list them. 11 Q. And do you know whether racially 12 polarized voting was present in any of those 13 elections? 14 A. I don't know. I have not read any 15 report on that matter, but I think it is general 16 common knowledge that statewide elections in the 17 last ten years in South Carolina tend to be racially 18 polarized. 19 Q. And if we go back to the bottom 20 histogram of Figure 12, it looks like both the 21 previous and the enacted plans perform -- or 22 generate eight wins for the Democrats. Is that 23 right? 24 A. That's right. 25 Q. And it's ten in the Harpootlian and LWV</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 171</p> <p>1 A. That has nothing to do with the race of 2 the voter. I agree. 3 Q. Let's move to page 26, Figure 12. And 4 it looks like this top chart in 12 -- or this top 5 histogram, to be more precise, is a histogram of 6 Table 7. Is that right? 7 A. That's right. It shows, I hope, if I 8 don't have any typos, the numbers that you see in 9 the key should match the total effectiveness numbers 10 in the table. 11 Q. And this bottom chart is a histogram 12 that shows other Democratic -- outcomes for other 13 Democratic candidates in 63 other races. Is that 14 right? 15 A. It is -- 16 Q. Or perhaps it's nine races disaggregated 17 over or reconstituted over seven districts. 18 A. We were just rushing to agree with each 19 other. It is nine contests times seven districts. 20 Q. So this is nine statewide races. 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. Reconstituted in the seven districts in 23 each of the plans. 24 A. That's right. 25 Q. And the total numbers are the number of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 173</p> <p>1 plans. Is that right? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. As well as NAACP2? 4 A. Yes. 5 Q. So I'm hoping, Doctor, as a 6 mathematician you can help me do a little math here 7 in Figure 12. 8 A. Here is hoping. 9 Q. Can you entertain me on that? At least 10 indulge me on that for a moment? So it looks like 11 in this top histogram the enacted plan generates 4 12 wins out of 28 races. 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. Do you know what percentage 4 out of 28 15 is? Or can you calculate that? 16 A. 7, I think, is about 14 percent. 17 Q. And in this bottom chart it's 8 out of 18 63. 19 A. Right. 20 Q. And do you know what that percentage is? 21 A. Well, let's see. 8 out 64 would be an 22 eighth, which is 12 and a half percent, so close to 23 that. 24 Q. So the enacted plan generates wins about 25 14 percent of the time for the Black preferred</p>

44 (Pages 170 - 173)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 174</p> <p>1 candidate in the races you examined, and about 12</p> <p>2 and a half percent of the time, maybe 13 percent of</p> <p>3 the time for the Democratic candidate in the races</p> <p>4 you examined. Is that right?</p> <p>5 A. Well, as you have repeatedly noted, the</p> <p>6 probative elections, those are also Democrats. So</p> <p>7 the 12.5 is for the other Democrats, not for -- it's</p> <p>8 not the union of them all. It's the complement of</p> <p>9 them.</p> <p>10 Q. Thank you. For now I'm just trying to</p> <p>11 compare these two histograms.</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. So the four elections that were</p> <p>14 identified to you as having racially polarized</p> <p>15 voting with a Black candidate of choice are in the</p> <p>16 top histogram.</p> <p>17 A. That's correct.</p> <p>18 Q. And the enacted plan generates wins for</p> <p>19 that candidate around 14 percent of the time, is</p> <p>20 that correct, because it 4 out of 28?</p> <p>21 A. The only thing I might quibble with is</p> <p>22 the word "generate," but yes --</p> <p>23 Q. Results in.</p> <p>24 A. That's right.</p> <p>25 Q. Yeah, it's a better term of art. Maybe</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 176</p> <p>1 A. Yeah. I would only just remind us all</p> <p>2 that wins are a function of two inputs, the votes</p> <p>3 and the plan. Not the plan alone, not the votes</p> <p>4 alone, but the combination of the votes and the</p> <p>5 plan. So yes, the four candidates have a higher</p> <p>6 percentage of wins. They also have a higher</p> <p>7 percentage of votes.</p> <p>8 Q. All right. Let's turn to page 27. I</p> <p>9 just want to make sure I understand some of the</p> <p>10 phrasing that's being used here.</p> <p>11 A. Sure.</p> <p>12 Q. The third sentence says: "Only 12.4</p> <p>13 percent of maps drawn in a race-neutral fashion, top</p> <p>14 of Figure 12, have as low an effectiveness score as</p> <p>15 the state's plan."</p> <p>16 A. Yes.</p> <p>17 Q. What are being referred to as the maps</p> <p>18 drawn in a race-neutral fashion?</p> <p>19 A. That's the ensemble, which I'm just</p> <p>20 reminding the reader was drawn in a race-neutral</p> <p>21 fashion.</p> <p>22 Q. And drawn subject to the other</p> <p>23 considerations and parameters you set in the</p> <p>24 algorithm. Right?</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 175</p> <p>1 we will use "results."</p> <p>2 And then for this second histogram,</p> <p>3 which is 63 other races -- well, it's nine other</p> <p>4 races over seven districts, the enacted plan results</p> <p>5 in wins for the Democratic candidate about 12 and a</p> <p>6 half or 13 percent of the time. Is that correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. So the enacted plan results in wins for</p> <p>9 the Black candidate of choice more frequently in</p> <p>10 that first histogram than for the Democratic</p> <p>11 candidate in the second histogram. Correct?</p> <p>12 A. Well, let's be clear. The four</p> <p>13 candidates fared better statewide than the</p> <p>14 counterparts in the second histogram. So their vote</p> <p>15 pole, statewide, was considerably higher. So it's</p> <p>16 not surprising at all. But actually, I suppose I</p> <p>17 should let you get to the question. So it's true</p> <p>18 that the percentage is higher in the first set. And</p> <p>19 then was there a question about that?</p> <p>20 Q. I was trying to get a yes or no, but I</p> <p>21 think you gave it to me. So you agree the</p> <p>22 percentage is higher.</p> <p>23 A. I do.</p> <p>24 Q. Percentage of wins -- resulting wins is</p> <p>25 higher in the first set than in the second set?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 177</p> <p>1 Q. And then you say something about --</p> <p>2 starting with the sentence that starts: "This</p> <p>3 shows" -- "This shows many alternatives that were</p> <p>4 available to the legislature will tend to allow</p> <p>5 Black voters an opportunity to elect candidates of</p> <p>6 choice at a level in keeping with the human and</p> <p>7 political geography of the state." And my question</p> <p>8 is, what is the human and political geography of the</p> <p>9 state being referenced here?</p> <p>10 A. Oh, sure. First, though, because you</p> <p>11 just read much of that paragraph but skipped a few</p> <p>12 things, so if you don't mind, I will take a moment</p> <p>13 to just read it through.</p> <p>14 Q. Yes, please.</p> <p>15 A. So I what I wrote is: "Only 12.4</p> <p>16 percent of maps drawn in a race-neutral fashion,</p> <p>17 parentheses, top of Figure 12, have as low an</p> <p>18 effectiveness score as the state's plan when</p> <p>19 considering the probative elections. By far the</p> <p>20 most common outcome for these blindly drawn maps is</p> <p>21 six wins for the Black candidate of choice, with</p> <p>22 another significant spike at eight. This shows that</p> <p>23 many alternatives" -- and I will add, outside of the</p> <p>24 voice of the report, this is many thousands of</p> <p>25 alternatives, "that were available to the</p>

45 (Pages 174 - 177)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 178</p> <p>1 legislature from the NAACP options to the LWV map to 2 the compromise plan represented by the Harpootlian 3 amendment will tend to allow Black voters an 4 opportunity to elect candidates of choice at a level 5 in keeping with the human and political geography of 6 the state." 7 Okay. So what is meant by that? So 8 "human geography" is a phrase that means demographic 9 distribution. That's what human geography means. 10 It means where people live and which people live in 11 which locations. That's human geography. 12 Political geography is the distribution 13 of votes. It's how people cast votes and in 14 correspondence with where they live. So the reason 15 that phrase is being used here is that the function 16 of an ensemble analysis is to take us away from 17 abstract notions like proportionality and have us 18 focus on what districts tend to produce under the 19 realistic geographic conditions of who lives where. 20 So it is often said, by me and others, that 21 ensembles are powerful because they hold constant 22 the human geography. All ensembles are drawn 23 against the same human geography and the old 24 constant -- the political geography, all ensembles 25 operate against the same pattern of votes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 180</p> <p>1 Q. That's fine. I was just trying to get 2 the basis of the statement. And if there is any 3 other analysis -- is there any other analysis that 4 forms the basis of that statement? 5 A. I would say that the statement is 6 primarily justified by those two factors, 7 traditional principles as they were measured in the 8 metrics and the electoral outcomes as featured in 9 the Figure 12. 10 Q. So for this sentence is there -- are you 11 offering any support or opinion in support of this 12 statement other than the analysis that's in your 13 reports? 14 A. No. It's only the analysis that's in 15 the report. 16 Q. And you say that the maps from ten years 17 ago and again this year submerged traditional 18 principles in order to secure this outcome? 19 A. I do. 20 Q. Can you tell me which traditional 21 principles they submerge? 22 A. Sure. If we go back to section 4, the 23 metrics section, I think that, arguably, compactness 24 is sacrificed, political subdivisions are higher 25 than they would be if they were being prioritized</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 179</p> <p>1 So when I say here: "A level in keeping 2 with the human and political geography of the 3 state," what I mean is that the human-drawn maps and 4 the computer-drawn maps are assessed against the 5 same pattern of residential and political 6 distribution. 7 Q. The next sentence says: "The state's 8 maps from ten years ago and again from this year are 9 the ones that are demonstrably diluted, and as we 10 have seen, they submerge traditional principles in 11 order to secure this outcome." 12 A. Correct. 13 Q. What analysis did you do on the State's 14 maps from ten years ago? 15 A. I think it's featured throughout the 16 report, probably in a dozen or more places. Should 17 we go through and itemize them? That's a sincere 18 question. Tell me what you mean. It's featured 19 throughout the review of metrics, for example, which 20 is what I'm using to talk about traditional 21 principles, and it's featured in the comparisons 22 that immediately precede that conclusion; namely, 23 it's featured in Figure 12, looking at the 24 effectiveness and probative and other Democratic 25 elections. So that's the basis of the statement.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 181</p> <p>1 more. So that includes city splits, town splits, 2 subdivision splits, county splits. And all of the 3 more qualitative features that are discussed in 4 section 5, with respect to the enacted plan which 5 have to do with when you split something, how do you 6 split it, those are also at issue. 7 Q. And all those traditional principles 8 involve tradeoffs with other principles, as we 9 discussed before. Correct? 10 A. Always. 11 Q. So if we go back to page 27 -- 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. -- how is it that you conclude that a 14 certain performance on traditional principles was 15 done in order to secure the dilution of Black votes 16 or Black voting strength? 17 A. In other words, just to be sure I 18 understand the question, you're asking could it be a 19 coincidence that the traditional principles -- that 20 the metrics are worse on traditional principles? Is 21 that the question? 22 Q. Well, I guess I'm asking -- you said 23 that the -- you pointed to the metrics on additional 24 principles and said they are worse in the enacted 25 plan than in other plans.</p>

46 (Pages 178 - 181)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 182</p> <p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. At least with respect to certain</p> <p>3 metrics.</p> <p>4 A. That's right.</p> <p>5 Q. And then I read this sentence to be</p> <p>6 drawing a straight line between that relative</p> <p>7 performance on those metrics and a conclusion that</p> <p>8 that relative performance was undertaken for the</p> <p>9 purpose of securing the outcome of diluting Black</p> <p>10 voting strength. Have I read the sentence</p> <p>11 correctly?</p> <p>12 A. I think I understand what you're asking.</p> <p>13 So I would say I don't tend to make conclusions like</p> <p>14 that based on metrics alone. I try to always do a</p> <p>15 multifactorial analysis. And in this case there</p> <p>16 are -- all the tools that I have used here kind of</p> <p>17 point in this way. So there are quantitative tools</p> <p>18 in the metrics section, there are qualitative tools</p> <p>19 in the detailed district review. There is a look at</p> <p>20 BVAP. There is a look at electoral performance.</p> <p>21 These are many different kinds of evidence. And</p> <p>22 you're absolutely right that in an analysis like</p> <p>23 this you can't rule out the presence of other</p> <p>24 reasons. That is very difficult to do, in general.</p> <p>25 All you can do, as I emphasized early on, is to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 184</p> <p>1 conclusion.</p> <p>2 Q. Going down to Section 8, the</p> <p>3 "Conclusion," I think we have covered most of this</p> <p>4 ground but I just want to confirm my understanding,</p> <p>5 the first sentence of section 8 says: "By comparing</p> <p>6 various plans for South Carolina Congressional</p> <p>7 districting, I find that the state's plan</p> <p>8 Enacted2022 expressly contravenes the legislature's</p> <p>9 own Guidelines, which clearly state" -- and then</p> <p>10 there is a quote which I won't read, for the benefit</p> <p>11 of the court reporter. Am I reading the sentence</p> <p>12 correctly, if I understand, that the express</p> <p>13 contravention of the legislature's own guidelines is</p> <p>14 its contravention, in your judgment, of what's</p> <p>15 quoted here, which is about minority voting</p> <p>16 strength?</p> <p>17 A. That's right. And with apologies to the</p> <p>18 court reporter, just to refresh my memory of my own</p> <p>19 claim here, that quote is: "Any proposed</p> <p>20 redistricting plan that is demonstrated to have the</p> <p>21 intent or effect of dispersing or concentrating</p> <p>22 minority population in a manner that prevents</p> <p>23 minorities from electing their candidates of choice</p> <p>24 will be neither accepted nor approved." I do feel</p> <p>25 that that is expressly contravened by the choice of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 183</p> <p>1 marshal evidence in support of a conclusion like</p> <p>2 this.</p> <p>3 So I suppose better phrasing might be to</p> <p>4 say that they submerge traditional principles as</p> <p>5 though in order to secure this outcome. Right?</p> <p>6 What I'm trying to get at is I cannot be sure of all</p> <p>7 the reasons in play. All I can know is what's in</p> <p>8 the public record. But I find no countervailing</p> <p>9 explanation in the public record that leads me to</p> <p>10 doubt the causal relationship that I'm describing</p> <p>11 here.</p> <p>12 Q. And what do you mean by "the public</p> <p>13 record"?</p> <p>14 A. I mean I have described what I examined</p> <p>15 and it included all the voluminous public testimony,</p> <p>16 it included published guidelines issued by both the</p> <p>17 House and the Senate. And I have not seen</p> <p>18 explanations in that public record. You're right,</p> <p>19 that I should be careful, "public record" could mean</p> <p>20 any number of things. And I have already conceded</p> <p>21 that I did not review all of the legislative record.</p> <p>22 But the record that I did review, which included the</p> <p>23 State's Guidelines in two forms and the public</p> <p>24 testimony as well as my knowledge of the ways that</p> <p>25 these criteria tend to interact, lead me to this</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 185</p> <p>1 plan among the options that were before the State.</p> <p>2 Q. And is it an intent violation?</p> <p>3 A. Happily, for me, the quote allows for</p> <p>4 intent or effect. Now, the use of ensembles has</p> <p>5 repeatedly been found to be helpful in discerning</p> <p>6 likely intent, but it's only evidence. It's not</p> <p>7 conclusive. But I find it to be strong evidence.</p> <p>8 And the effect, I think, is also clear from this</p> <p>9 kind of evidence. But the effect is to be</p> <p>10 uncommonly ineffective, especially in those most</p> <p>11 probative elections.</p> <p>12 Q. So in your opinion that is being</p> <p>13 conveyed in this sentence, does the plan, in your</p> <p>14 view, violate the Guidelines because of intent or</p> <p>15 because of effect?</p> <p>16 MS. ADEN: Objection.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Let me try to answer that.</p> <p>18 I think I wrote that in a spirit -- and I continue</p> <p>19 to support a spirit that's agnostic to intent or</p> <p>20 effect. I think there is evidence of intent. I</p> <p>21 think there is evidence of effect. I think that,</p> <p>22 collectively, intent or effect has been</p> <p>23 well-supported by this evidence.</p> <p>24 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>25 Q. But you don't have an opinion either</p>

47 (Pages 182 - 185)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 186</p> <p>1 way, whether it's intent or effect. Is that right?</p> <p>2 MS. ADEN: Objection.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I again -- and I'm not</p> <p>4 trying to slip out of the question but just trying</p> <p>5 to be precise about my position, I feel I have</p> <p>6 provided evidence for both intent and effect. And I</p> <p>7 leave it to others to measure the strength of that</p> <p>8 evidence against their standards for intent and</p> <p>9 effect.</p> <p>10 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>11 Q. So I'm just trying to understand this</p> <p>12 sentence. And the sentence doesn't say that you</p> <p>13 found evidence. It says that you found that the</p> <p>14 enacted plan expressly contravenes the Guidelines.</p> <p>15 A. Right.</p> <p>16 Q. And I'm just trying to understand what</p> <p>17 you meant by that. Is there more you can help me</p> <p>18 with there?</p> <p>19 A. Sure. I can try. So I'm a</p> <p>20 mathematician. I'm a data scientist. And so my</p> <p>21 findings -- especially in a report like this, but</p> <p>22 many of my writings, more generally, have to do with</p> <p>23 evidence. So I try not to make findings that are</p> <p>24 rooted only in sentiment, but to make findings that</p> <p>25 are rooted in evidence. And so when I say "I find,"</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 188</p> <p>1 sets of Guidelines, that concerns like communities</p> <p>2 of interest, district cores and so on should be</p> <p>3 considered but cannot outweigh the protection of</p> <p>4 minority electoral opportunity. So this sentence is</p> <p>5 succinct, but I feel that its gist is supported</p> <p>6 throughout the Guidelines on both sides.</p> <p>7 Q. Thank you for that. What I'm trying to</p> <p>8 understand is, are there other considerations in the</p> <p>9 Guidelines, whether it was compactness or anything</p> <p>10 else, that you think the enacted plan expressly</p> <p>11 contravenes?</p> <p>12 A. Well, the full complement of principles,</p> <p>13 as we have noted repeatedly, they function as a</p> <p>14 balancing act. And so part of the evidence has to</p> <p>15 be, and what I hope I have expressed throughout this</p> <p>16 report, I have looked to the other principles as</p> <p>17 possible explanatory factors. That is, if the State</p> <p>18 were truly optimizing its compactness, if it were</p> <p>19 making its compactness just as good as possible, if</p> <p>20 that were top of mind, that might drive other</p> <p>21 metrics to suffer. That does not seem to be the</p> <p>22 case. So it is a holistic assessment, I want to</p> <p>23 insist, that has to do with trying to use the full</p> <p>24 spectrum of tools to analyze that balancing act.</p> <p>25 And I have failed to find an aspect that was fully</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 187</p> <p>1 we can take that to be shorthand for I have</p> <p>2 satisfied myself that there is strong evidence.</p> <p>3 Q. And have you satisfied that there is</p> <p>4 strong evidence that the enacted plan has the intent</p> <p>5 of dispersing minority population?</p> <p>6 A. I do think there is evidence of an</p> <p>7 intent here.</p> <p>8 Q. And do you think that there is evidence</p> <p>9 that the enacted plan has the effect of dispersing</p> <p>10 minority population?</p> <p>11 A. Yes. I think -- once again, just at the</p> <p>12 risk of repetition, I think there is evidence of</p> <p>13 intent and evidence of effect.</p> <p>14 Q. And the next sentence says:</p> <p>15 "Considering" -- I'm sorry. One last question on</p> <p>16 this sentence.</p> <p>17 A. Sure.</p> <p>18 Q. When you say that the enacted plan</p> <p>19 expressly contravenes the legislature's own</p> <p>20 Guidelines, were there other aspects or</p> <p>21 considerations in the Guidelines that the enacted</p> <p>22 plan, in your judgment, expressly contravenes, or is</p> <p>23 it only what's quote here?</p> <p>24 A. Well, the full context of the</p> <p>25 Guidelines, I feel, repeats over and over in both</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 189</p> <p>1 explanatory of all the small and large choices that</p> <p>2 I saw that end with the effect of dispersing</p> <p>3 minority population in a manner that prevents</p> <p>4 minorities from electing their candidates of choice.</p> <p>5 So I think this is responsive. And I'm trying to be</p> <p>6 succinct. It's really the guideline documents as a</p> <p>7 whole. But this sentence goes very far to explain.</p> <p>8 It's pointing to the clearest spirit of the</p> <p>9 Guidelines that I think is not upheld by the plans.</p> <p>10 Q. I think the next sentence says:</p> <p>11 "Considering this strong guidance, and the increased</p> <p>12 Black population in the Columbia and Charleston</p> <p>13 areas, we would expect increased electoral</p> <p>14 opportunities for Black voters to be reflected in</p> <p>15 the Congressional plan." Why would we expect that?</p> <p>16 A. What this means is if someone were to</p> <p>17 follow the spirit of the quoted sentence, their</p> <p>18 opportunity to create effective districts has</p> <p>19 probably only gone up. The ability to create</p> <p>20 effective electoral opportunity for Black voters has</p> <p>21 probably only increased since ten years ago because</p> <p>22 of the increased Black population in key areas. So</p> <p>23 since -- what this sentence means to say is that</p> <p>24 since the Guidelines tell us that we should not</p> <p>25 prevent minorities from electing their candidates of</p>

48 (Pages 186 - 189)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 190</p> <p>1 choice and since the opportunity is there, then we</p> <p>2 would expect to see someone following the guidelines</p> <p>3 to present the plan with increased electoral</p> <p>4 opportunities over the plan from ten years ago.</p> <p>5 Q. And you said that the General Assembly</p> <p>6 would have had the ability to increase Black voting</p> <p>7 opportunity. Did it have an obligation to do so, in</p> <p>8 your opinion?</p> <p>9 A. That's a good question. That's maybe</p> <p>10 more of a legal question than one that I am</p> <p>11 attempting to address in this report. Did they have</p> <p>12 the obligation? The Guidelines seem to provide -- I</p> <p>13 don't think you would call it an obligation, but an</p> <p>14 imperative, a mention, a goal.</p> <p>15 So the Guidelines express that minority</p> <p>16 electoral opportunity is an important principle for</p> <p>17 the state. Is that an obligation? I don't know</p> <p>18 that that rises to the level of an obligation.</p> <p>19 Q. Now, in the second paragraph here under</p> <p>20 Section 8, the last sentence says: "Each time I</p> <p>21 examined a decision with both racial and partisan</p> <p>22 elements in the design of the state's plan, I found</p> <p>23 that racial factors predominated over not only</p> <p>24 traditional principles, but even over partisan</p> <p>25 ones." Where, in your report, is that examination</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 192</p> <p>1 the public testimony.</p> <p>2 So I think that what I'm getting at, in</p> <p>3 the Conclusion, is that both the kind of</p> <p>4 quantitative analysis that's offered in Figure 12</p> <p>5 and the qualitative analysis that emerged from my</p> <p>6 review of public testimony and my examination of</p> <p>7 specific splitting decisions and selective healing</p> <p>8 decisions, those both point to the same conclusion</p> <p>9 of racial predominance over even partisan concerns.</p> <p>10 Q. And when you were analyzing the splits</p> <p>11 and selective healing, to use your term, of</p> <p>12 precincts, did you review any partisan or political</p> <p>13 data as part of that analysis?</p> <p>14 A. Well, I did. And you can see that in</p> <p>15 the public testimony. So, for example, in</p> <p>16 Dorchester County Tim Lewis identifies himself as</p> <p>17 the chair of the Democratic Party, whereas in the</p> <p>18 Coastal region Scott Anderson identifies himself in</p> <p>19 the federation of Republican men. So there is quite</p> <p>20 a bit of partisan self-identification taking place</p> <p>21 in the public testimony, and that's what I'm</p> <p>22 referring to.</p> <p>23 Q. And when you were considering the splits</p> <p>24 and selective healing precincts, again, to use your</p> <p>25 term, did you look at election data with respect to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 191</p> <p>1 of those decisions recorded or discussed?</p> <p>2 A. Well, the most direct place that racial</p> <p>3 and partisan -- the tension between racial and</p> <p>4 partisan motivations is addressed is in Figure 12</p> <p>5 which we just spent time unpacking. So you're</p> <p>6 asking where else have I compared racial to partisan</p> <p>7 motivations other than that section?</p> <p>8 Q. If anywhere, yes. I'm just trying to</p> <p>9 understand -- first I'm trying to understand, you</p> <p>10 said, "I examined a decision with both racial and</p> <p>11 partisan elements." I'm trying to understand what</p> <p>12 decisions you're referring to.</p> <p>13 A. I mean a placement of the lines. So,</p> <p>14 for instance, looking at Figure 3, which looks at</p> <p>15 the terrain that has moved in and out of CD 6, that</p> <p>16 those are places where you can localize decisions</p> <p>17 that have been made in the shift from the benchmark</p> <p>18 to the enacted plan. And I find that many of those</p> <p>19 decisions, particularly about what I have called, in</p> <p>20 this report, the selective healing of counties and</p> <p>21 VTDs and other relevant geounits, many of the splits</p> <p>22 that are not chosen for being healed or addressed</p> <p>23 are, as I describe here, in neighborhoods</p> <p>24 particularly salient to Black communities. And that</p> <p>25 conclusion is drawn, once again, from a review of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 193</p> <p>1 those splits or repairs of precincts?</p> <p>2 A. I think -- tell me if I'm understanding</p> <p>3 right, you're asking, in my analysis that looked at</p> <p>4 particular precincts, did I look at those precincts'</p> <p>5 voting history?</p> <p>6 Q. Yes.</p> <p>7 A. Yes, I certainly had that data available</p> <p>8 to me. I didn't do a kind of systematic</p> <p>9 quantitative analysis that I presented in the</p> <p>10 report.</p> <p>11 Q. Okay. That's what I'm getting at. So I</p> <p>12 think it's section 5 of your report which we can</p> <p>13 turn to, if helpful, but I didn't see anything in</p> <p>14 section 5 that did any kind of electoral analysis.</p> <p>15 Is that right?</p> <p>16 A. That is right, section 5, except in the</p> <p>17 ways that it refers back to the testimony in the</p> <p>18 appendix, some of which, again, is partisan.</p> <p>19 Section 5 doesn't, in the body, talk about</p> <p>20 partisanship. But it was certainly part of the</p> <p>21 holistic and qualitative review.</p> <p>22 Q. But, for example, you didn't use the</p> <p>23 election data set that you were provided in Figure</p> <p>24 12 when analyzing the district splits or shifts in</p> <p>25 District 5 or in section 5, is that right, or</p>

49 (Pages 190 - 193)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 194	<p>1 section 4?</p> <p>2 A. I did think about that data but did not</p> <p>3 present a quantitative summary of it in the report.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. So, for example -- this is just</p> <p>5 an example, you didn't say: Look at the Charleston</p> <p>6 splits, which you talk about in section 5, and</p> <p>7 analyze whether those splits had a partisan pattern</p> <p>8 to them based on election data and past election</p> <p>9 results?</p> <p>10 A. I did look at -- I'm trying to be</p> <p>11 complete in my answers. I did look at -- for the</p> <p>12 terrain pictured in Figure 3, I did look at partisan</p> <p>13 balance as well as racial balance of those areas.</p> <p>14 And I determined that, on the whole, they were more</p> <p>15 racially skewed than they were partisan skewed. But</p> <p>16 I did not present a systematic discussion or a</p> <p>17 quantitative discussion of that in my report. But</p> <p>18 it is my belief, based on the analysis that I did,</p> <p>19 both quantitative and qualitative, that this moved</p> <p>20 terrain is more racially distinctive than it is</p> <p>21 partisan skewed.</p> <p>22 Q. But you haven't reported -- you haven't</p> <p>23 said that in your report. Correct?</p> <p>24 A. That's right.</p> <p>25 Q. And you haven't provided any supporting</p>	Page 196	<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. This document, do you recognize this</p> <p>3 document?</p> <p>4 A. Yes. This is my CV, although I can't</p> <p>5 yet tell whether it's the most recent update. But</p> <p>6 it's my CV.</p> <p>7 Q. And how would you tell whether it's the</p> <p>8 most recent update?</p> <p>9 A. I can see now that it is, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. I don't think I have any further</p> <p>11 questions on that. Thank you.</p> <p>12 Dr. Duchin, if I have done this</p> <p>13 correctly, Exhibit 7, the expert report of Sean</p> <p>14 Trende should be on the screen. Can you see that?</p> <p>15 A. I can.</p> <p>16 (Exhibit No. 7, Expert Report of Sean P. Trende, was</p> <p>17 marked)</p> <p>18 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>19 Q. And are you familiar with this document?</p> <p>20 A. Yes.</p> <p>21 Q. Have you read it?</p> <p>22 A. Yes. This is the -- just be clear, the</p> <p>23 report dated -- I'm looking for a date. There is no</p> <p>24 date on the first page. Yes, the last page. Yes,</p> <p>25 I'm familiar with this report.</p>
Page 195	<p>1 data for that view in your report. Correct?</p> <p>2 A. Well, I think you have all the data that</p> <p>3 constitutes these figures, but it's true that I have</p> <p>4 not provided any such demonstrative in the report.</p> <p>5 Q. And you haven't provided a chart or any</p> <p>6 breakdown of reconstituted election data for those</p> <p>7 areas identified in Figure 3. Correct?</p> <p>8 A. That's right. I have not provided that.</p> <p>9 But it is something that I thought about in forming</p> <p>10 my impressions.</p> <p>11 MR. GORE: So at this point we have been</p> <p>12 going again for a little bit than over an hour. Can</p> <p>13 we go off the record for just a second?</p> <p>14 (Break In Proceedings)</p> <p>15 MR. GORE: Let's go ahead and go back on</p> <p>16 the record.</p> <p>17 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>18 Q. Dr. Duchin, did you discuss your</p> <p>19 testimony or this deposition with anyone during the</p> <p>20 break?</p> <p>21 A. No, I didn't.</p> <p>22 Q. I would like to show you a new exhibit</p> <p>23 which is now marked as Exhibit 6.</p> <p>24 (Exhibit No. 6, Curriculum Vitae of Moon Duchin,</p> <p>25 PhD, was marked)</p>	Page 197	<p>1 Q. And this is the report from April 18th,</p> <p>2 2022. Is that right?</p> <p>3 A. Correct.</p> <p>4 Q. Do you recall whether Mr. Trende's</p> <p>5 report mentions your analysis in this case anywhere?</p> <p>6 A. I don't believe he mentions my analysis</p> <p>7 or used my name anywhere.</p> <p>8 Q. And you submitted a rebuttal report in</p> <p>9 this case. Is that correct?</p> <p>10 A. I think I called it a response, but yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And if Mr. Trende's report did not</p> <p>12 mention you or your analysis, why did you submit a</p> <p>13 rebuttal or response report?</p> <p>14 A. To respond to several of the points that</p> <p>15 he made that I felt were related to those that I had</p> <p>16 discussed.</p> <p>17 (Exhibit No. 8, May 4, 2022 Response to the Expert</p> <p>18 Report of Sean P. Trende dated April 18, 2022, was</p> <p>19 marked)</p> <p>20 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>21 Q. So if I have done this correctly,</p> <p>22 everybody has just watched me upload Exhibit 8 into</p> <p>23 Exhibit Share. Can you see that, Dr. Duchin?</p> <p>24 A. I can see it, yes.</p> <p>25 Q. And is this the report that you were</p>

50 (Pages 194 - 197)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 198</p> <p>1 just referring to, your response or rebuttal report?</p> <p>2 A. Yes. That's correct.</p> <p>3 Q. I note that the title just says</p> <p>4 "Report."</p> <p>5 A. That's true. This says I have been</p> <p>6 asked to provide a brief response.</p> <p>7 Q. Right. And so that is dated May 4th,</p> <p>8 2020 -- or 2022?</p> <p>9 A. That's right.</p> <p>10 Q. Thank you. Thank you for that</p> <p>11 correction. So I just want to ask a few questions</p> <p>12 about your rebuttal report.</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. So under Section 2 that you have titled</p> <p>15 as Summary, the second bullet point is what I would</p> <p>16 like to start asking you questions about.</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. The second sentence says: "The</p> <p>19 alternative plan shown in my previous report,</p> <p>20 section 6.2, including Figure 11, is just one</p> <p>21 example. 92 percent of the population is assigned</p> <p>22 to districts exactly as in Enacted2022."</p> <p>23 A. Yes.</p> <p>24 Q. And I believe we talked about this</p> <p>25 alternative earlier today, what we were talking</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 200</p> <p>1 core preservation number. You wouldn't learn that</p> <p>2 just from multiplying, but I would agree that that's</p> <p>3 probably true.</p> <p>4 Q. And the third bullet point, you discuss</p> <p>5 Mr. Trende's statement about repairing split</p> <p>6 counties and precincts?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And then you mention the Harpootlian</p> <p>9 map?</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. And I believe what you say here is</p> <p>12 substantially fewer subdivision splits?</p> <p>13 A. That is what I say here, yes.</p> <p>14 Q. And is that based on the numbers that</p> <p>15 are in your other report?</p> <p>16 A. Yes, the ones we have already reviewed.</p> <p>17 Q. And do you know how the Harpootlian map</p> <p>18 compares to the enacted plan with respect to</p> <p>19 precinct splits or VTD splits?</p> <p>20 A. I don't know. I'm trying to think if --</p> <p>21 no, that number is not in the report, I'm fairly</p> <p>22 sure. But if you think it is, please just show it</p> <p>23 to me.</p> <p>24 Q. Yeah, I don't believe it is. I'm just</p> <p>25 trying to confirm that I didn't miss something.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 199</p> <p>1 about, the cracking portion of your report. Is that</p> <p>2 correct?</p> <p>3 A. I think it did come up in passing.</p> <p>4 Q. And you say that 92 percent of the</p> <p>5 population in that plan is the same -- is assigned</p> <p>6 to districts exactly as in the enacted plan.</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Did you also run any kind of core</p> <p>9 retention analysis on this plan, your alternative</p> <p>10 plan, compared to the benchmark plan?</p> <p>11 A. I must have, yes. I don't have those</p> <p>12 numbers in front of me, but it's quite easy to</p> <p>13 compare any two plans, and so I suspect that I have</p> <p>14 comparison numbers for every pair of plans.</p> <p>15 Q. Did you provide those comparison plans</p> <p>16 or comparison numbers in this report?</p> <p>17 A. No. But you can get a -- you can get an</p> <p>18 estimate by multiplying. So if this has 92 percent</p> <p>19 agreement and that plan has a certain percent core</p> <p>20 retention, then you can estimate by multiplying how</p> <p>21 much this compares to the benchmark.</p> <p>22 Q. And if we conducted that estimate here,</p> <p>23 would your alternative plan have a lower core</p> <p>24 preservation number than the enacted plan?</p> <p>25 A. Oh, I suspect that it does have a lower</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 201</p> <p>1 A. I tend to agree with you.</p> <p>2 Q. Wonderful. And do you know how the</p> <p>3 Harpootlian map performs, whether it performs better</p> <p>4 or worse than the enacted map on preserving the</p> <p>5 cores of the benchmark districts?</p> <p>6 A. Oh, it must be worse, because the</p> <p>7 enacted plan is so much like the benchmark. And</p> <p>8 since -- it follows since the Harpootlian plan makes</p> <p>9 big changes that it must have lower core retention.</p> <p>10 Q. And do you know how the Harpootlian map</p> <p>11 performs on any partisan metrics or outcomes?</p> <p>12 A. Well, yes. We just reviewed some of</p> <p>13 that. So we can see, in Figure 12 from my first</p> <p>14 report, how it performs in the probative elections</p> <p>15 and in the other Democratic elections.</p> <p>16 Q. And as I recall that discussion, the</p> <p>17 Harpootlian plan results in more wins for the</p> <p>18 Democratic candidate than the enacted plan. Is that</p> <p>19 correct?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. Looking at Figure 12 that's true</p> <p>21 both for the probative races, and for the other</p> <p>22 races it has a few more wins.</p> <p>23 Q. So I believe here, in section 3, on the</p> <p>24 next page of core retention --</p> <p>25 A. Yes.</p>

51 (Pages 198 - 201)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 202	<p>1 Q. -- you note in the first paragraph the</p> <p>2 relative core retention percentages between the</p> <p>3 enacted plan and the Harpootlian plan. Is that</p> <p>4 right? Am I reading that correctly?</p> <p>5 A. Let me review. Yes. "It essentially</p> <p>6 revises the state's plan in a single boundary line."</p> <p>7 So it has an average core retention score of nearly</p> <p>8 92 percent but gets a markedly better electoral</p> <p>9 opportunity, et cetera, et cetera.</p> <p>10 Q. So back to page 1, this bullet point at</p> <p>11 the bottom --</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. -- in referring to the Harpootlian map,</p> <p>14 you say: "This map is comparable or superior to</p> <p>15 state plan Enacted2022 in all traditional</p> <p>16 districting principles and provides measurably</p> <p>17 greater minority opportunity to elect." Did I read</p> <p>18 that correctly?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 Q. But it doesn't perform comparably or</p> <p>21 superior to an Enacted2022 on core preservation or</p> <p>22 VTD splits. Is that right?</p> <p>23 A. Oh, I don't have the VTD split number in</p> <p>24 front of me, but -- and honestly, at the moment I</p> <p>25 cannot remember if I made that comparison. I simply</p>	Page 204	<p>1 valance or valence?</p> <p>2 A. It's valence.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. Can you explain to me what that</p> <p>4 means?</p> <p>5 A. Sure. I mean, sometimes people describe</p> <p>6 core retention as a good government principle, and</p> <p>7 at least as often they describe core retention as</p> <p>8 cutting against good government principles.</p> <p>9 Q. And are you aware of how it has been</p> <p>10 described in any laws or prior cases in South</p> <p>11 Carolina?</p> <p>12 A. I am aware, let's see, the Guidelines</p> <p>13 say that they are drawn from, I think, in</p> <p>14 particular, the Senate Guidelines. I just want to</p> <p>15 get this right. They say they are drawn, in part,</p> <p>16 from a 2002 opinion, a 2012 opinion and input</p> <p>17 received in public hearings. So that leads me to</p> <p>18 suspect, since they talk about constituent</p> <p>19 consistency, it's a reasonable guess that it would</p> <p>20 have potentially been discussed in some of those</p> <p>21 opinions. But I don't know, to be clear.</p> <p>22 Q. Yeah. And in your opinion is preserving</p> <p>23 cores a traditional districting principle?</p> <p>24 A. Right. So I have made an effort here --</p> <p>25 the term "traditional" is a bit vague. And I do</p>
Page 203	<p>1 can't remember if I made that comparison.</p> <p>2 As for cores, I think that there is a</p> <p>3 sort of judgment question as to whether core</p> <p>4 preservation is a traditional principle. I think</p> <p>5 you could -- you could call it traditional in that</p> <p>6 it is often cited, but it is also often omitted from</p> <p>7 most of the traditional principles. So I did not</p> <p>8 mean to include that here. And as you know, I</p> <p>9 didn't include core retention in the previous</p> <p>10 report's metrics.</p> <p>11 Q. Is core preservation identified as a</p> <p>12 principle in the Senate Guidelines?</p> <p>13 A. It's in one set and not the other. So I</p> <p>14 believe you if you say it's the Senate and not the</p> <p>15 House.</p> <p>16 Q. Now turning back to section 3 --</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. -- I believe you say what you just said,</p> <p>19 which is in the second paragraph, first sentence:</p> <p>20 "The retention of prior districts is a commonly</p> <p>21 articulated principal in redistricting."</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 Q. And then you go on to say: "It can be</p> <p>24 described in terms of a positive or a negative" --</p> <p>25 and this is another good word for me, is that</p>	Page 205	<p>1 certainly concede that it is an often considered</p> <p>2 principle. So traditional, in that sense, yes. In</p> <p>3 my opinion, is it a good government principle? That</p> <p>4 really depends on the way that it's put in place.</p> <p>5 It's just very situational. I have seen instances</p> <p>6 where I think it is being carried out in the best</p> <p>7 interests of voters and instances where it is not.</p> <p>8 Q. So I would like to probe that a little</p> <p>9 bit more. There is a sentence in the second</p> <p>10 paragraph that starts: "In this case."</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. "In this case, the appeal to core</p> <p>13 preservation is used to keep minority population</p> <p>14 dispersed across multiple districts, whereas the</p> <p>15 shifting population and the reduction in BVAP in CD</p> <p>16 6 would likely have led to the creation of new</p> <p>17 opportunities in a neutral process." So my first</p> <p>18 question is, is the neutral process referred to here</p> <p>19 what we discussed in your prior report or does that</p> <p>20 refer to something else?</p> <p>21 A. I'm sorry. I'm just trying to catch up.</p> <p>22 Se we are in section 3 of the response report?</p> <p>23 Q. Of the response report. And it's about</p> <p>24 the middle of that second paragraph, fifth line</p> <p>25 down, it starts at the very end of the line,</p>

52 (Pages 202 - 205)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 206</p> <p>1 right-hand side of the line.</p> <p>2 A. Yes. Thank you. That's right. "The</p> <p>3 appeal to core preservation is used to keep" -- or</p> <p>4 you might say used to justify, either way --</p> <p>5 "minority population dispersed across multiple</p> <p>6 districts, whereas the shifting population and the</p> <p>7 reduction in BVAP in CD 6 would likely have led to</p> <p>8 the creation of new opportunities in a neutral</p> <p>9 process." Right. Well, it's certainly true that</p> <p>10 the ensemble generation process is meant to model</p> <p>11 neutral process. But I don't mean to imply that</p> <p>12 ensemble generation is a perfect representation of</p> <p>13 every possible neutral process. It is one kind of</p> <p>14 neutral process.</p> <p>15 Q. What is the neutral process being</p> <p>16 referred to in this sentence?</p> <p>17 A. This sentence means if the -- if the</p> <p>18 Guidelines are taken literally, they seem, to me, to</p> <p>19 say -- and here it's a little bit hard because the</p> <p>20 House and the Senate Guidelines are slightly</p> <p>21 different, but trying to generalize across both they</p> <p>22 seem to say that considerations such as cores, if</p> <p>23 they appear at all in the Guidelines, are described</p> <p>24 as not meriting a reduction in minority electoral</p> <p>25 opportunity. I think that's fair to say about the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 208</p> <p>1 voting opportunity under the Guidelines?</p> <p>2 A. Well, literally, here it says a manner</p> <p>3 that prevents minorities from electing their</p> <p>4 candidates of choice. So I suppose, if you ask that</p> <p>5 of the authors of the Guidelines what's the intent</p> <p>6 of their phrasing, I think that means dispersing in</p> <p>7 a manner that prevents relative to what was</p> <p>8 possible. I think what that means, at least just</p> <p>9 the plain English reading, I think -- and you can</p> <p>10 tell me if you agree -- is that, for example, if</p> <p>11 there are several competing options presented, one</p> <p>12 has more opportunity and one has less, then core</p> <p>13 preservation can't be reason to choose the one with</p> <p>14 less opportunity. That seems, clearly, to be how to</p> <p>15 read this.</p> <p>16 Q. And so, in your opinion, do the</p> <p>17 Guidelines require the General Assembly to choose</p> <p>18 the plan with the highest minority voting</p> <p>19 opportunity, all other things being equal?</p> <p>20 A. No. And to explain that fully, I'm not</p> <p>21 sure they require anything. It's especially hard</p> <p>22 for me to tell from the way they are written. But I</p> <p>23 don't read them to require anything. I read them</p> <p>24 only to provide guidelines, although they do say</p> <p>25 that they have the authority to determine the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 207</p> <p>1 Guidelines. And so I find that in the spirit of the</p> <p>2 Guidelines they don't provide a justification for</p> <p>3 reduced minority electoral opportunity.</p> <p>4 Q. And when you say the Guidelines don't</p> <p>5 provide a justification for reduced minority</p> <p>6 opportunity, what is the reduced minority</p> <p>7 opportunity contemplated but not justified by the</p> <p>8 Guidelines?</p> <p>9 A. Is there something else?</p> <p>10 Q. Well, I'm trying to understand what you</p> <p>11 just said. So maybe reduced compared to some other</p> <p>12 baseline or comparator, but I think you said that</p> <p>13 the Guidelines -- that other considerations in the</p> <p>14 Guidelines can't be read to merit a reduction of</p> <p>15 minority voting opportunity.</p> <p>16 A. That's right. In particular, House</p> <p>17 Guidelines IX a. make that very explicit, that any</p> <p>18 of the lower-ranked considerations such as</p> <p>19 incumbency and COIs and so on, if there is a</p> <p>20 conflict with those and minority opportunity,</p> <p>21 minority opportunity should be given priority. I</p> <p>22 think it pretty clearly says that in IX a., to my</p> <p>23 reading.</p> <p>24 Q. And so what would be the comparator to</p> <p>25 determine whether there has been reduced minority</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 209</p> <p>1 criteria. But I still don't think that rises to the</p> <p>2 level of a legal requirement.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So I'm trying to understand your</p> <p>4 hypothetical. You said if there were two plans</p> <p>5 presented, one with higher minority voting</p> <p>6 opportunity and one with lower minority voting</p> <p>7 opportunity, preservation of cores could not be</p> <p>8 invoked to choose the plan with lower minority</p> <p>9 voting opportunity.</p> <p>10 A. Under the Guidelines.</p> <p>11 Q. Under the Guidelines. So my question</p> <p>12 is, is it your reading of the Guidelines that when</p> <p>13 all other things are equal with respect to other</p> <p>14 principles or traditional criteria, the General</p> <p>15 Assembly had to choose the plan with the highest</p> <p>16 minority voting opportunity?</p> <p>17 A. No. But you presented a scenario in</p> <p>18 which -- or I think we are discussing a scenario in</p> <p>19 which all other things are equal and the differences</p> <p>20 are a tradeoff strictly between district core</p> <p>21 preservation and minority electoral opportunity. If</p> <p>22 we posit that that's the tradeoff, all other things</p> <p>23 being roughly equal, then I wouldn't say the</p> <p>24 Guidelines require anything. But I would say they</p> <p>25 direct the legislature to choose the one with more</p>

53 (Pages 206 - 209)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 210</p> <p>1 minority opportunity as opposed to higher core 2 retention, yes. I think that is directed, but I 3 wouldn't say required. 4 Q. So let me rephrase and see if I 5 understand your point. Is it your reading that the 6 Guidelines direct the General Assembly not to trade 7 off compliance with some other principle at the 8 expense of minority voting opportunity? 9 A. So sorry, but I think my entering got 10 cut out in the middle of your sentence. Can you 11 repeat that? 12 Q. It was such a good sentence, I don't 13 know, but I will try. Is it your reading of the 14 Guidelines that the Guidelines direct the General 15 Assembly not to trade off less minority voting 16 opportunity for better compliance with the other 17 principles in the Guidelines or considerations in 18 the Guidelines? 19 A. Well, an exception might be population 20 balance, which is in the first tier here. But 21 specifically as to core retention, my reading is 22 that they are directed to prioritize minority 23 electoral opportunity over core retention. That's 24 correct. 25 Q. And what about over other principles</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 212</p> <p>1 part and parcel of redistricting. Is that right? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. Is it your reading that the Guidelines 4 direct the General Assembly, when faced with such 5 tradeoff between minority voting strength on the one 6 hand and a second-tier consideration on the other 7 hand, to choose the option that prioritizes minority 8 voting strength? 9 A. I think that's the plain language here. 10 And let me stipulate that I might not have written 11 it exactly this way. But reading the way they wrote 12 it, I do think that's what they say. 13 Q. Okay. And have you discussed the 14 Guidelines with whoever wrote them? 15 A. I certainly haven't. And I have no idea 16 who wrote them. 17 Q. And do you know one way or another 18 whether the standard in the Guidelines was simply 19 meant to be an articulation of what Section 2 of the 20 Voting Rights Act requires? 21 A. Not simply. It says that it goes beyond 22 the Voting Rights Act. And both sets of the 23 Guidelines reference other principles such as equal 24 protection. So it's not simply a recording of 25 Section 2.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 211</p> <p>1 that you have placed in the second tier? 2 A. Okay. Let's review. Yes. I think it 3 says the requirements addressed in sections 1, 2, 3 4 and 4 should be given priority if there is a 5 conflict. 6 Q. So on your reading, the Guidelines 7 direct the General Assembly to maximize voting -- 8 minority voting strength to the extent it can do so 9 while trading off compliance with the second-tier 10 considerations? 11 A. I would shy away from the word 12 "maximize" which has a very specific meaning for me. 13 I don't think there is maximization here. But I do 14 think that, again, to quote, if there is a conflict, 15 the requirements that include minority electoral 16 opportunity should be given priority. So they are 17 directed, in case of conflict, to prioritize 18 minority electoral opportunity over compactness over 19 district cores and so on. 20 Q. So this is helpful, but let me ask it 21 another way, if that's okay. We talked earlier that 22 redistricting involves tradeoffs. Right? That the 23 criteria may cut in different directions or that a 24 map drawer may prioritize one criterion or 25 consideration over another and that tradeoffs are</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 213</p> <p>1 Q. And do the Guidelines refer to anything 2 other than equal protection, the U.S. Constitution 3 and the Voting Rights Act when discussing 4 considerations of minority voting strength? 5 A. They do. They also refer to the 6 opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States. 7 Q. And have you reviewed those opinions? 8 A. I believe I have read all the relevant 9 opinions. Now, that's not to say that I have an 10 attorney's professional vetted interpretation of 11 them, but I believe I have read all the relevant 12 things. 13 Q. And have you analyzed whether the 14 enacted plan violates Section 2? 15 A. That was not part of my assignment. 16 Q. And I just want to return to this 17 sentence again: "In this case, the appeal to core 18 preservation is used to keep minority population 19 dispersed across districts" -- "multiple districts," 20 that again, reads like a statement of the map 21 drawer's purpose, "used to keep minority population 22 dispersed." Am I reading that correctly? 23 A. Well, yes. That is what it says, yes. 24 When we went over it a few moments ago, maybe 25 fifteen minutes ago, I said that might have been</p>

54 (Pages 210 - 213)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 214</p> <p>1 better phrased by me as used to keep or used to 2 justify. 3 Q. And let's look at the next sentence. I 4 think you say -- it starts: "I am not aware of any 5 principle in law or in published redistricting 6 guidelines that allows for a threshold level of high 7 core preservation to justify excessively 8 race-conscious decisions with a known dilutive 9 effect." 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. So is it your opinion that the General 12 Assembly or a map drawer, in this case, is using 13 high core preservation to justify excessively 14 race-conscious decisions? 15 A. And who were the people you referred to? 16 The map drawer or who? 17 Q. The General Assembly. The legislature. 18 A. It's a bit hard to identify who all the 19 relevant stakeholders and folks expressing opinions 20 are. So, in particular, the focus of this report is 21 to respond to Sean Trende's expert report. And I do 22 not know the extent to which Trende's 23 representations are consonant with those of the 24 Assembly or the map drawer. So I maybe want to be 25 careful about whose opinions I'm describing. But</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 216</p> <p>1 Well, the sentence that we just reviewed of mine 2 only says I don't know of anything in law that 3 allows for this to justify that. So I'm not 4 ascribing a justification to anyone. I'm just, in 5 particular, here -- 6 Q. So is this statement -- is this then 7 meant to be a general principle or a description of 8 something in this case, specific to this case? 9 A. That sentence, "I am not aware," is a 10 general statement. It is relevant to this case 11 because I feel that in various of the documents that 12 are circulating there are attempts, implicit or 13 explicit, to justify reduced minority electoral 14 opportunity with these kinds of factors being 15 partisan and core-preserving criteria. 16 Q. And which documents make that 17 justification expressly or explicitly? 18 A. I feel it's explicit in the Trende 19 report. And also in the motion to dismiss it is, 20 let's see, somewhere on the line of implicit and 21 explicit. But we can pull that up. But first I 22 will tell you my general impression is that the 23 motion to dismiss asserts that plaintiffs would need 24 to disambiguate racial from partisan motives. So 25 that, in other words, at least implicitly, if not</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 215</p> <p>1 Trende certainly writes -- and again, that's who I'm 2 primarily responding to, Trende certainly writes as 3 though both core preservation and partisan 4 motivation are justifications for the minority 5 opportunity to elect that is embodied in the plan. 6 Q. Have you discussed Mr. Trende's report 7 with him? 8 A. With him? I don't think we have met, 9 although I look forward to it. 10 Q. And is it possible to read his report 11 not as a justification for any decisions but as an 12 explanation for what he observed in reviewing the 13 plan? 14 A. Well, again, I am trying to be quite 15 careful, and so you will forgive me for speaking 16 slowly and deliberately. I'm trying to be quite 17 careful about what opinions I attribute to whom. 18 But his report certainly reads as though the 19 partisan motivations and the core retention are 20 legitimate justifications that explain the reduced 21 minority electoral opportunity. 22 Q. So in this sentence is the person doing 23 the justifying in this sentence Mr. Trende or 24 somebody else? 25 A. I'm pulling up the sentence again.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 217</p> <p>1 explicitly, partisan motives are an allowable 2 justification for racially disparate outcomes. 3 Q. And have you discussed the motion to 4 dismiss with the author of that motion? 5 A. No, I haven't. 6 Q. Another question, if I can find it, 7 section 4: "Respect for boundaries, Communities of 8 interest." 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. The second paragraph, I think what 11 you're talking about is VTD splits in the benchmark 12 plan and the enacted plan? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. And maybe it's at the end of paragraph 15 one. 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. So I just want to make sure I have my 18 facts correct. When the benchmark plan was drawn, 19 it split 13, 2010 VTDs. Is that correct? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. And are you aware that South Carolina 22 redrew its VTD lines between 2010 and 2020? 23 A. I don't think they are able to redraw 24 their VTD lines. They can redraw their precinct 25 lines, but VTDs are Census Bureau data product.</p>

55 (Pages 214 - 217)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 218</p> <p>1 Q. So are you aware that South Carolina 2 redrew its precinct lines between 2010 and 2020? 3 A. That seems very likely. 4 Q. And by the time the 2020 census data 5 came out, the benchmark plan, at least according to 6 your report, then split 65 2020 VTDs. 7 A. That's right. And just to help clarify 8 this piece of the conversation, let me just say one 9 sentence about VTDs versus precincts. Precincts are 10 a moving target. Not only states but local 11 authorities can change precincts often, at any time, 12 and often -- for any reason. In many cases they 13 don't even have to report those changes to the 14 state, which is a strange state of affairs. 15 VTDs are a once per ten years effort of 16 the Census Bureau to find out a snapshot of those 17 precincts and reconcile with the other census 18 geography. So the reason people in a redistricting 19 analysis like to use VTDs is that they are a fixed 20 target rather than a moving target. 21 So one other piece of the puzzle that's 22 relevant here is that it's quite common, in various 23 states around the country, to draw a plan; and then 24 where that plan split VTDs, to change the precincts 25 to nest better in the plan. So it's a really very</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 220</p> <p>1 Q. Is preserving or keeping VTDs whole a 2 traditional districting principle, in your opinion? 3 A. Good question. It comes back to parsing 4 traditional. But traditionally we talk about 5 political boundaries. It's a bit ambiguous whether 6 precincts are included, but I think they often are 7 included under the umbrella of political boundaries. 8 Q. And is preserving or not splitting VTDs 9 a traditional districting principle, in your 10 opinion? 11 A. Do you mean as distinct from precincts? 12 Q. Sure. 13 A. I don't think the traditional principles 14 will distinguish between those two. 15 Q. And do you recall whether the House or 16 Senate Guidelines identified avoiding VTD or 17 precinct splits as one of the considerations for 18 drawing the congressional plan? 19 A. Yes, I recall that at least one of them 20 did. Let's check quickly. Yeah, VTDs are mentioned 21 by name only in the Senate but not in the House 22 Guidelines. 23 Q. And in your experience, in your opinion, 24 Dr. Duchin, is it possible for a map drawer to 25 preserve cores of districts without engaging in race</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 219</p> <p>1 complicated set of facts here. And I felt that the 2 wording in the Trende report was misleading, made it 3 sound like there were very few VTDs split. But that 4 was partly due to not specifying whether he was 5 talking about 2010 or 2020 VTDs. 6 Q. And do you know anything about whether, 7 in South Carolina, there is a difference between the 8 precinct line and VTD lines in 2020? 9 A. Well, there is probably no economical 10 source of precinct boundary data, and so I wouldn't 11 know how to start to make the comparison. 12 Q. Do you know, one way or the other, 13 whether the state maintains a database of precincts 14 in South Carolina? 15 A. I know that many states, and I believe 16 South Carolina is one, make an effort to keep an 17 up-to-date boundary file. But very few states, and 18 I believe South Carolina is not one, have strong 19 reporting requirements for local authorities. So I 20 do think there is an effort to make current data 21 product, but it's really very hard to do. 22 Q. In your experience does keeping VTDs or 23 precincts whole make election administration easier 24 for election officials than if they are split? 25 A. Definitely.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 221</p> <p>1 conscious decision-making? 2 A. Well, let me try to answer that simply 3 but fully. I think that, inevitably, 4 decision-makers are aware of the level of -- at 5 least roughly of the level of racial -- of minority 6 electoral opportunity that exists in the benchmark 7 plan. And so implicitly, a decision to prioritize 8 cores is going to be a decision to maintain the 9 status quo, roughly -- roughly speaking of minority 10 electoral opportunity. So is that race conscious? 11 Well, that comes back to the question of whether we 12 are considering proxies. That's not race conscious 13 in the sense that you have a race data layer 14 visible, but it has -- of course it has 15 ramifications for minority electoral opportunity, 16 necessarily. 17 Q. Is it possible for a map drawer, in your 18 experience, to prioritize core preservation without 19 sacrificing minority voting opportunity? 20 A. Definitely, especially in areas that are 21 not diverse. 22 MR. GORE: I think I have no further 23 questions, so I'm ready at this point to pass the 24 witness to whoever would like to ask questions. 25 Maybe Andrew, I think if you maybe have</p>

56 (Pages 218 - 221)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 222</p> <p>1 some questions, want to take over at this point?</p> <p>2 And Ms. Trinkley, do you have any questions for this</p> <p>3 witness?</p> <p>4 MS. TRINKLEY: Yes. I think just one.</p> <p>5 CROSS-EXAMINATION</p> <p>6 BY MS. TRINKLEY:</p> <p>7 Q. Do you know what governmental bodies in</p> <p>8 South Carolina have the authority to change precinct</p> <p>9 lines?</p> <p>10 A. Good question. I don't. I don't</p> <p>11 specifically know the South Carolina rules, only I</p> <p>12 have worked with election administrators across the</p> <p>13 country so I have a sense of how it's done</p> <p>14 generally. But I don't have specific knowledge of</p> <p>15 the rules of South Carolina.</p> <p>16 MS. TRINKLEY: Thank you. That's all</p> <p>17 the questions I have.</p> <p>18 MR. MATHIAS: And I have a few. It</p> <p>19 might be about thirty minutes. Does anybody want a</p> <p>20 ten-minute break or can we keep going?</p> <p>21 (Off-Record Discussion)</p> <p>22 MR. MATHIAS: Well, let's keep going.</p> <p>23 CROSS-EXAMINATION</p> <p>24 BY MR. MATHIAS:</p> <p>25 Q. Dr. Duchin, Andrew Mathias. I know we</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 224</p> <p>1 software programs that's referenced the MGGG</p> <p>2 Redistricting Lab, GerryChain Python Library?</p> <p>3 A. That's right. Our two biggest software</p> <p>4 packages are GerryChain, which is a Markov chain</p> <p>5 library, and Districtr which is a community mapping</p> <p>6 tool.</p> <p>7 Q. It's footnote 4 to your report, or I</p> <p>8 guess in that 4 reference, the GerryChain Python</p> <p>9 Library, is that referring to software or is that</p> <p>10 referring to something else that is proprietary to</p> <p>11 the MGGG or Tufts?</p> <p>12 A. It's software, and it's fully public.</p> <p>13 It's not proprietary to anyone. It's fully public,</p> <p>14 and I should mention much copied.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. You mentioned that it is sort of</p> <p>16 a group of people that I have seen online that it</p> <p>17 grew out of the metric geometry and gerrymandering</p> <p>18 group. Are any of these -- well, either yourself,</p> <p>19 as the primary investigator, staff, post-doc or</p> <p>20 undergrad folks paid by MGGG or Tufts for their work</p> <p>21 with MGGG?</p> <p>22 A. Yes. For example, right now the staff</p> <p>23 of MGGG, through Tisch College, is a program</p> <p>24 administrator and a research analyst. That's much</p> <p>25 reduced from last summer, around time that the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 223</p> <p>1 met virtually some months ago. I don't remember</p> <p>2 when, frankly. I represent the House defendants in</p> <p>3 this case. I have, hopefully, just a handful of</p> <p>4 questions. And you can answer this first one</p> <p>5 however you want. What is the MGGG Redistricting</p> <p>6 Lab?</p> <p>7 A. Okay. So I am a professor at Tufts</p> <p>8 University, and as I mentioned I'm affiliated with</p> <p>9 the Tisch College of Civic Life. And as part of</p> <p>10 Tisch College I run the lab called MGGG</p> <p>11 Redistricting Lab. What it means to run a lab is</p> <p>12 that we are a collection of people. We have staff.</p> <p>13 We have -- I'm the only tenure stream faculty, but</p> <p>14 we have had postdoctoral scholars, graduate student</p> <p>15 affiliates, undergraduate, as well as, as I said,</p> <p>16 full-time and part-time staff. So we are a</p> <p>17 collection of people whose primary function is to do</p> <p>18 scholarly research in redistricting. And so we have</p> <p>19 a significant output of peer-reviewed articles, a</p> <p>20 book that just came out, which I believe we</p> <p>21 discussed several months ago. And we also write a</p> <p>22 substantial body of open-source software that we use</p> <p>23 and that we hope others will use in analyzing not</p> <p>24 only redistricting, but other voting-rights issues.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. Is one of those open-source</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 225</p> <p>1 census data came out when we had, I think, over a</p> <p>2 dozen people on staff.</p> <p>3 Q. And how much are you paid for your work</p> <p>4 with MGGG?</p> <p>5 A. I am not paid for my work with MGGG.</p> <p>6 It's part of my profile as a professor.</p> <p>7 Q. Okay. Is everyone that works with MGGG,</p> <p>8 other than you, paid or are there some folks that</p> <p>9 are doing it as part of their academic work?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, that's correct, some are doing</p> <p>11 academic work with us, which is typically unpaid,</p> <p>12 and others are doing sort of data analysis that is</p> <p>13 typically paid for.</p> <p>14 Q. Okay. Is MGGG, in some way shape or</p> <p>15 form, located in a physical space on Tufts' campus?</p> <p>16 A. Yes. I'm sitting in it. We have</p> <p>17 offices in Barnum Hall on Tufts' campus.</p> <p>18 Q. Okay. Does MGGG pay rent to Tufts for</p> <p>19 the space it has in Barnum Hall?</p> <p>20 A. That's a bit of a subtle question. We</p> <p>21 raise grant support which has a component that's</p> <p>22 called "indirect" which is used to defray costs like</p> <p>23 keeping the lights on and so on. So when we get a</p> <p>24 grant --</p> <p>25 Q. Overhead?</p>

57 (Pages 222 - 225)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 226</p> <p>1 A. Overhead. Exactly. So when we get a</p> <p>2 grant, say, from the Sloan Foundation, 10 percent of</p> <p>3 the amount that goes to us will be added on top and</p> <p>4 will go to the University. When we get a grant from</p> <p>5 the National Science Foundation, it's 66 percent.</p> <p>6 I would add something, though, to</p> <p>7 clarify all this. We have been discussing the</p> <p>8 academic piece, which is the lab, as part of Tufts.</p> <p>9 But I also have an LLC that I use for consulting.</p> <p>10 And for matters relating to litigation, pay does not</p> <p>11 go through the University. I'm a professor who has</p> <p>12 several roles. I have a robust conflict of interest</p> <p>13 policy that I follow here at the University, and I</p> <p>14 keep litigation income quite separate from the</p> <p>15 University and its functions.</p> <p>16 Q. Yes, I saw the invoices were from the</p> <p>17 Redistricting Lab, LLC. So you have mentioned</p> <p>18 something, and I may not have it correct, but I will</p> <p>19 see if I can find the word. You mentioned that you</p> <p>20 rely on other people to do things such as data</p> <p>21 curation, writing code, running computational</p> <p>22 scripts and then reviewing public hearing testimony.</p> <p>23 Who did that for the purposes of your report?</p> <p>24 A. So I have multiple research assistants.</p> <p>25 And in the invoices that I submitted to LDF, they</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 228</p> <p>1 provided research support, as reflected in the</p> <p>2 invoices, and those are Cora Chanel Richardson who</p> <p>3 has a degree in computer engineering and provides</p> <p>4 support on the computing side, and Liz Kopecky who</p> <p>5 has a background in policy and project management.</p> <p>6 Q. And I'm assuming both Cora and Liz also</p> <p>7 work for MGGG, or is that incorrect?</p> <p>8 A. They are also both employees of Tisch</p> <p>9 College.</p> <p>10 Q. Okay. Doing work for MGGG?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. And those two individuals, Cora and Liz,</p> <p>13 were the ones who did the work of data curation,</p> <p>14 writing code, running computational scripts and</p> <p>15 reviewing public testimony in support of you in</p> <p>16 drafting this report?</p> <p>17 A. Yes. But to be clear, so Cora</p> <p>18 Richardson goes by the name Chanel. And Chanel did</p> <p>19 the coding and data work and Liz helped review</p> <p>20 public testimony.</p> <p>21 Q. Would either Chanel or Liz know how to</p> <p>22 do what they did to support you in writing this</p> <p>23 report if they had not worked at MGGG?</p> <p>24 A. I would say, in Chanel's case, that she</p> <p>25 came in with substantial Python expertise. But, I</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 227</p> <p>1 are typically identified Research Assistant 1,</p> <p>2 Research Assistant 2 and so on. And they are</p> <p>3 performing analysis under my direction. We can talk</p> <p>4 about who they are, but first let me just clarify</p> <p>5 the overall division of labor, the LLC that I</p> <p>6 mentioned, which is a consulting company, also has,</p> <p>7 at the moment, one full-time employee and several</p> <p>8 part-time employees who have nothing to do with the</p> <p>9 University. So they really are kind of separate</p> <p>10 options.</p> <p>11 However, it is the case, and again fully</p> <p>12 in compliance with the conflict of interest policies</p> <p>13 at my University, that several people work on both</p> <p>14 sides. So if people who are employed by Tufts</p> <p>15 University do work for litigation, they do so on</p> <p>16 evenings and weekends and are compensated through</p> <p>17 the LLC and not through the University. So even</p> <p>18 though it may sound like thoroughly intermixed, we</p> <p>19 are actually quite scrupulous about separation of</p> <p>20 resources. Having said that, do you want to talk</p> <p>21 about who the research assistants were who involved</p> <p>22 in this project?</p> <p>23 Q. Yes. Who were they?</p> <p>24 A. Sure. So I believe for the</p> <p>25 congressional side there were exactly two people who</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 229</p> <p>1 mean, certainly, working with our particular code</p> <p>2 base was something that she was trained in over her</p> <p>3 time in the lab.</p> <p>4 In Liz's case, reviewing public</p> <p>5 testimony, I think, takes no special knowledge or</p> <p>6 training.</p> <p>7 Q. So all Liz did was review public</p> <p>8 testimony?</p> <p>9 A. That's right.</p> <p>10 Q. Did she -- and this is word I'm trying</p> <p>11 to find -- operationalize -- did she help</p> <p>12 operationalize that public testimony?</p> <p>13 A. No. I'm the one who synthesized,</p> <p>14 summarized and drew the operational regions that</p> <p>15 were used in the ensemble analysis.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. In your testimony you</p> <p>17 mentioned -- well, for the most part you testified</p> <p>18 in the first-person singular. On occasion you would</p> <p>19 say something in the first-person plural, our</p> <p>20 method. We found our ensemble. We, our, that's you</p> <p>21 and MGGG or you and who?</p> <p>22 A. Not necessarily. Depending on context,</p> <p>23 it often will mean me and collaborators, that is</p> <p>24 the -- this is something I tried not to be pedantic</p> <p>25 about throughout the course of this deposition, but</p>

58 (Pages 226 - 229)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 230</p> <p>1 there are algorithms and then there are</p> <p>2 implementations and code. The algorithms are fairly</p> <p>3 abstract. They tell you, kind of, the mathematical</p> <p>4 ideas behind what you will be doing. And then the</p> <p>5 code is programming. So often when I say "we" or</p> <p>6 "our," I'm talking about my scientific</p> <p>7 collaborations. For example, the algorithms, the</p> <p>8 concept behind the GerryChain package are described</p> <p>9 in a peer-reviewed paper that appeared in the</p> <p>10 Harvard Data Science Review that's joint work with</p> <p>11 Darryl DeFord and Justin Solomon. Darryl is a</p> <p>12 professor at Washington State and Justin is a</p> <p>13 professor at MIT. So partly I'm trained to say</p> <p>14 "our" when I talk about joint work so that I don't</p> <p>15 forget to acknowledge that so much scientific work</p> <p>16 is done collaboratively.</p> <p>17 Q. Fair. And that article you're talking</p> <p>18 about is "Mathematics of nested districts: The</p> <p>19 case" -- no. I'm sorry. It is: "Recombination: A</p> <p>20 family of Markov chains for redistricting"?</p> <p>21 A. And Markov is M-A-R-K-O-V. That's</p> <p>22 correct.</p> <p>23 Q. And that's the article you list in your</p> <p>24 references as number 3?</p> <p>25 A. I can check that, but that is the main</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 232</p> <p>1 supporter of MGGG is the National Science</p> <p>2 Foundation. Is that correct?</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 Q. And the National Science Foundation, is</p> <p>5 an agency of the federal government that gives</p> <p>6 grants. Is that correct?</p> <p>7 A. Yes. And, in particular, we -- the lab</p> <p>8 received a million-dollar grant to study what we</p> <p>9 called network science and census data.</p> <p>10 Q. Is that the only grant that the lab --</p> <p>11 and I'm using that to refer to MGGG -- has received</p> <p>12 from the National Science Foundation?</p> <p>13 A. No. To be clear, when you apply for an</p> <p>14 NSF grant you have a PI, or a principal</p> <p>15 investigator. And that PI is a person, not a lab.</p> <p>16 So I am the PI on numerous NSF grants. I have,</p> <p>17 typically, several that are active at any time.</p> <p>18 Q. So is that grant that you talked about</p> <p>19 the only grant that has been used to fund MGGG, the</p> <p>20 only NSF grant?</p> <p>21 A. No. I had a -- for example, there</p> <p>22 really have been numerous grants that -- partly from</p> <p>23 the activities of the lab, but another example would</p> <p>24 be a grant from several years ago that funded a</p> <p>25 summer program called the "Voting Rights Data</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 231</p> <p>1 article that offers the kind of theoretical</p> <p>2 framework for the ensemble process.</p> <p>3 Q. Can you describe for a minute, then,</p> <p>4 how -- how critical the methods described in that</p> <p>5 article are for your expert report and rebuttal that</p> <p>6 we have been discussing today?</p> <p>7 A. Sure. The parts of my report that use</p> <p>8 ensembles, which I believe are sections 6 and 7, but</p> <p>9 we can check, those rely on those ideas of</p> <p>10 recombination. The traditional districting</p> <p>11 principles, the quality and the review, and so on,</p> <p>12 does not rely on Markov chains.</p> <p>13 Q. And those are a fairly critical form of</p> <p>14 maybe the core of your opinion and report. Is that</p> <p>15 correct?</p> <p>16 A. Well, I wouldn't say that the work is</p> <p>17 holistic and has many components, but I do find the</p> <p>18 ensemble evidence to be compelling.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. And you find the ensemble</p> <p>20 evidence to be compelling and believe that the court</p> <p>21 should find it compelling as well. Correct?</p> <p>22 A. That would be my hope.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. On the MGGG website there is a</p> <p>24 sort of, I guess, donation page or fundraising page,</p> <p>25 and it indicates that the largest financial</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 233</p> <p>1 Institute."</p> <p>2 Q. Okay. Is the million dollar grant</p> <p>3 you're talking about Convergence Accelerator Phase I</p> <p>4 Network Science and Census Data?</p> <p>5 A. Yes, that's the one. And a million is a</p> <p>6 round number. It might have been \$964,000.</p> <p>7 Q. Does \$962,177 sound right?</p> <p>8 A. That sounds perfect.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. Do you ever interact with Laura</p> <p>10 Campbell at NSF?</p> <p>11 A. Laura Campbell was the program director</p> <p>12 for the convergence accelerator, I think. I think</p> <p>13 that's right. That sounds right.</p> <p>14 Q. That's correct. And just looking at the</p> <p>15 abstract, it says that the funds obligated to date</p> <p>16 were the 962,000 and change per fiscal year 2019 and</p> <p>17 that the end date was May 31st, 2021?</p> <p>18 A. I believe we got a no-cost extension for</p> <p>19 another year, although I could check the records to</p> <p>20 be sure.</p> <p>21 Q. Okay. And pursuant to this grant -- or</p> <p>22 by way of this grant did Tufts, you as principal</p> <p>23 investigator, receive anything in addition to the</p> <p>24 \$962,000 and change in 2019?</p> <p>25 A. As part of that grant there was a</p>

59 (Pages 230 - 233)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 234</p> <p>1 supplemental grant called a "rapid grant." The NFS 2 structure is really labyrinthy, so I will try to 3 describe this, but it can be complicated. So there 4 was a second grant, called a rapid grant, for an 5 additional \$100,000 that piggybacked on the 6 convergence accelerator and that we used to model 7 how campuses could support the COVID response of 8 hospitals. 9 Q. Okay. So this grant either initially 10 or -- well, initially and adding this piggyback 11 grant, exceeded a million dollars? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Okay. On this abstract -- well, the 14 abstract, itself, says that it was last modified on 15 November 30th, 2021 by you. Do you remember 16 modifying it? 17 A. Not specifically, no. 18 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that 19 you did not modify it or somebody else did? 20 A. I don't think it was modified after it 21 was initially submitted. I don't have a memory of 22 that. But maybe you can tell me if there are 23 specific elements that you would like me to try to 24 recall. 25 Q. There is a section called "Publications</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 236</p> <p>1 few years. 2 Q. Okay. So if I understand you correctly, 3 you're saying that this paper, the publication could 4 be attributable to research that was funded by more 5 than just this grant. But do you -- 6 A. Yes, definitely. 7 Q. Do you disagree that this grant, the 8 convergence accelerator grant, at least in part, 9 funded the publication and Recombination: A family 10 of Markov chains for redistricting? 11 A. So often my work -- so that particular 12 paper has some, but not a great deal of empirical 13 work of computational output in it. It has some but 14 it's more theoretical. So what is the sense in 15 which that grant supported the paper? It's that 16 particular grant included a buyout for one of my 17 courses. So that meant my teaching load was reduced 18 which enabled me to do more research. So I hope I'm 19 getting at the right thing for your question. 20 That's the sense in which the grant enabled the 21 research, is that it reduced my teaching obligation, 22 allowing me to do more scholarship. 23 Q. I will ask it a different way. This is 24 available online. It just says it was -- the 25 abstract was last modified by you in November of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 235</p> <p>1 produced as a result of this research" and it lists 2 four, but one of those is the Recombination: A 3 family of Markov chains for redistricting. Do you 4 have any reason to believe that you would not 5 attribute that article as being -- or that 6 publication as being produced as a result of the 7 research that this grant funded? 8 A. Right. So the policy of NSF is you can 9 hold one or several concurrent grants. For each one 10 you have a proposal which describes the work you set 11 out to do on that grant. So, for example, the 12 convergence accelerator that you talked about has 13 now concluded. But overlapping with it I had 14 another grant through the math department on what I 15 called something like Geometry and Randomness. And 16 a paper like that Markov chain paper would have 17 cited both of those grants and its acknowledgment of 18 funding support. So that is to say if I write a 19 paper that relates to the proposals of multiple 20 grants I will typically credit all of those grants 21 in the funding support for the paper and include the 22 paper in the outcome report for both of the grants. 23 So you shouldn't be surprised if you see that 24 particular paper mentioned in the documentation for 25 multiple of the grants that I have held in the last</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 237</p> <p>1 last year. And under Publications Produced, as in 2 results of this research, it lists the publication 3 that you say forms the basis -- or the methodology 4 discussed in that, and the research discussed in 5 that forms the basis of a significant portion of 6 your report. Do you have any reason to believe that 7 someone other than you listed that article as a 8 publication that was produced as a result of this 9 federally funded research? 10 A. I'm afraid I don't understand the 11 question at all. 12 Q. I will ask it again. Do you have any 13 reason to believe that the publication that you, 14 along with two others, wrote called Recombination: 15 A family of Markov chains of redistricting, was 16 listed as a publication produced as a result of this 17 research by someone other than you? 18 A. No. Of course that was by me. It was 19 probably listed as partly supported by that grant. 20 That is correct. And it would be actually out of 21 line for me to -- 22 MS. ADEN: Moon, you just froze. 23 BY MR. MATHIAS: 24 Q. Yeah. I think you froze at "out of line 25 for me to" --</p>

60 (Pages 234 - 237)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 238	<p>1 A. It would be out of line for me to have</p> <p>2 omitted it. I apologize. My internet is getting a</p> <p>3 little glitchy.</p> <p>4 Q. So it would be out of line for you to</p> <p>5 have omitted that publication among those that were</p> <p>6 produced as a result of this research for the</p> <p>7 convergence accelerator phase I grant. Correct?</p> <p>8 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you recall the date of that grant?</p> <p>10 A. No, but I have no reason to dispute the</p> <p>11 dates that you are representing.</p> <p>12 Q. Okay. It says September of 2019.</p> <p>13 September 10th, to be specific, does that sound</p> <p>14 about right?</p> <p>15 A. Sure.</p> <p>16 Q. And is that the largest single source of</p> <p>17 funding that MGGG has received to date?</p> <p>18 A. Yes.</p> <p>19 Q. You mentioned that -- I call her Liz. I</p> <p>20 can't think of her name or what she goes by now.</p> <p>21 Liz Kopecky and Chanel Richardson both work for</p> <p>22 MGGG, but their work for you, in support of your</p> <p>23 drafting this report, was done on nights and</p> <p>24 weekends or not on MGGG time. Is that correct?</p> <p>25 A. That's right.</p>	Page 240	<p>1 A. Definitely.</p> <p>2 Q. Does Tufts require an annual report of</p> <p>3 all employees to notify the University of conflicts</p> <p>4 of interest?</p> <p>5 A. I'm not sure about all employees, but</p> <p>6 definitely all faculty.</p> <p>7 Q. Certainly covering you. Correct?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, definitely.</p> <p>9 Q. And when do you submit those conflict of</p> <p>10 interest reports?</p> <p>11 A. I submit them whenever I get an email</p> <p>12 reminder, and I believe I submitted one in the last</p> <p>13 month.</p> <p>14 Q. And I don't have the document and I</p> <p>15 doubt you have it in front of you, but how do you</p> <p>16 characterize your conflict of interest with your</p> <p>17 Research Lab, LLC and the work at MGGG?</p> <p>18 A. I describe the existence of the LLC and</p> <p>19 I describe my consulting work as being -- I should</p> <p>20 mention, actually, as we speak, this year I'm on</p> <p>21 leave for my position at Tufts. So the conflict of</p> <p>22 interest is simpler than usual because this year I</p> <p>23 have no obligations as part my professorial</p> <p>24 position.</p> <p>25 Q. Is your compensation group reduced</p>
Page 239	<p>1 Q. Did they do it in the Barnum Hall MGGG</p> <p>2 office?</p> <p>3 A. Well, Chanel lives in North Carolina and</p> <p>4 has rarely set foot in Barnum Hall.</p> <p>5 Q. Okay. So she didn't help out Liz?</p> <p>6 A. No. Liz sometimes comes into the office</p> <p>7 but probably wouldn't have done this work in the</p> <p>8 office. Maybe at home, but I'm speculating.</p> <p>9 Q. Okay. You really don't know where she</p> <p>10 did it?</p> <p>11 A. I can't be sure.</p> <p>12 Q. Do you know who owned the computer that</p> <p>13 she did the work on?</p> <p>14 A. I do not.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. Is it possible, does she have a</p> <p>16 computer that's owned by Tufts for her work with</p> <p>17 MGGG?</p> <p>18 A. That is likely.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Is it also possible that she used</p> <p>20 her MGGG computer to do work for you in support of</p> <p>21 this report?</p> <p>22 A. I can't rule it out, but I could ask.</p> <p>23 Q. Okay. You mentioned -- well, you said</p> <p>24 something that indicates to me that you have some</p> <p>25 familiarity with Tufts' conflict of interest policy.</p>	Page 241	<p>1 because you're on leave?</p> <p>2 A. To zero. That's right.</p> <p>3 Q. That would be a reduction, I would</p> <p>4 think.</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Were you on leave in 2019?</p> <p>7 A. I have been on leave for the whole</p> <p>8 academic year, '19 to '20. Wait. Sorry. '19. No.</p> <p>9 Sorry. I'm getting confused about dates. I have</p> <p>10 been on leave for the current academic year, which</p> <p>11 is '21, '22.</p> <p>12 In 2019 I may have been on leave. I</p> <p>13 have been on leave a lot in the last few years. I</p> <p>14 was a Radcliffe fellow in 2018 to 2019, and so I was</p> <p>15 likely on leave at that time.</p> <p>16 Q. Okay. But you have worked with MGGG and</p> <p>17 Redistricting Lab, LLC during the time that you were</p> <p>18 on leave. Correct?</p> <p>19 A. Yes. So the LLC was probably created in</p> <p>20 2020 or thereabouts.</p> <p>21 Q. November of 2019 sound familiar?</p> <p>22 A. That could be right, yeah. And the --</p> <p>23 let's see. The lab at Tufts, I ran summer programs</p> <p>24 under the name of MGGG in summer of 2018 and '19. I</p> <p>25 can't remember when we shifted the name to include</p>

61 (Pages 238 - 241)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 242</p> <p>1 the word "Lab," but it might have been in 2019.</p> <p>2 That sounds possible.</p> <p>3 Q. Okay. So on your conflict of interest</p> <p>4 form you disclosed to the University the existence</p> <p>5 of Redistricting Lab, LLC, and you either disclosed</p> <p>6 or assumed that Tufts knows about MGGG and your</p> <p>7 association with it?</p> <p>8 A. No, the lab -- definitely, the lab is</p> <p>9 part of my annual faculty information form.</p> <p>10 Q. Do you describe in any way the overlap</p> <p>11 between the work of Redistricting Lab, LLC and the</p> <p>12 lab?</p> <p>13 A. Well, when I set up the LLC I had</p> <p>14 several meetings with University counsel to be sure</p> <p>15 that I was setting everything up in accordance with</p> <p>16 University policy. So I have met with -- I have met</p> <p>17 with general counsel for the University to be sure</p> <p>18 that I'm doing everything on the up and up.</p> <p>19 Q. Okay. Did you disclose to general</p> <p>20 counsel, either at that meeting or through your</p> <p>21 conflict of interest forms, that the work with</p> <p>22 Redistricting Lab, LLC for which you're being</p> <p>23 compensated would rely on work that was paid for by</p> <p>24 the federal government in the convergence</p> <p>25 accelerator grant?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 244</p> <p>1 because of the research they have done, but you</p> <p>2 don't think it's significant that the research was</p> <p>3 explicitly paid for by the federal government and</p> <p>4 then you're using it to make money is something that</p> <p>5 needs to be disclosed to the University?</p> <p>6 A. That's 100 percent standard. That's</p> <p>7 how -- that's how scholarship works. That's why --</p> <p>8 in my understanding, that's how the standards for</p> <p>9 experts work, is that the entire design of the</p> <p>10 system is that your scholarly expertise which, in</p> <p>11 the best case, would be funded by the federal</p> <p>12 government, would then be brought to bear in matters</p> <p>13 of interest to courts. I think that's how the</p> <p>14 system works.</p> <p>15 Q. Okay. But did you disclose those</p> <p>16 specific facts to Tufts?</p> <p>17 A. I think those are well understood by all</p> <p>18 parties, and so I very much doubt that anything was</p> <p>19 said explicitly. I take that to be common</p> <p>20 understanding of how the system works.</p> <p>21 Q. So you made a decision on your own that</p> <p>22 that was not a conflict of interest and chose not to</p> <p>23 disclose it to Tufts. Is that correct?</p> <p>24 MS. ADEN: Objection.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I think I have answered</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 243</p> <p>1 A. It's an absolutely well-understood</p> <p>2 principle of faculty activities that your research</p> <p>3 is not neatly separable between roles. And so I</p> <p>4 should mention that in addition to talking to Tufts</p> <p>5 University counsel, I also talked to numerous</p> <p>6 experienced expert witnesses from other universities</p> <p>7 to be sure that I was setting things up in</p> <p>8 accordance with best practices. And I assure you</p> <p>9 that everything has been done quite scrupulously. I</p> <p>10 feel very confident about that.</p> <p>11 Q. Sure. This is a simple yes or no</p> <p>12 question. Did you tell any of those folks that you</p> <p>13 asked for advice that an article that was produced,</p> <p>14 as a result of this grant to Tufts, was going to</p> <p>15 support or form the basis of your report for which</p> <p>16 you would be paid?</p> <p>17 A. I don't need to mention that because</p> <p>18 that's -- I think that is the reason that people who</p> <p>19 do scholarship are asked to be experts, so that they</p> <p>20 can reference their scholarship. I don't think</p> <p>21 there is any disclosure there. That would be taken</p> <p>22 for granted by anyone who has experience with</p> <p>23 faculty working as expert witnesses.</p> <p>24 Q. I don't doubt that, in part, the reason</p> <p>25 that academics are asked to be expert witnesses is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 245</p> <p>1 fully. I don't think that's -- I think the</p> <p>2 relationship of my scholarship to my consulting is</p> <p>3 not only completely standard but is the design of</p> <p>4 the system of expert witnesses, as I understand it</p> <p>5 as I read the Daubert standard and so on.</p> <p>6 BY MR. MATHIAS:</p> <p>7 Q. But this is a simple question. You can</p> <p>8 answer yes or no and then explain. Isn't it true</p> <p>9 that you made the decision that this NSF grant</p> <p>10 resulting in this article, that is used in your</p> <p>11 report, was not a conflict of interest on your own</p> <p>12 and that is why you did not disclose it to the</p> <p>13 University?</p> <p>14 MS. ADEN: Objection.</p> <p>15 BY MR. MATHIAS:</p> <p>16 Q. Yes or no and then explain.</p> <p>17 A. I would answer yes or no if I could.</p> <p>18 But the truth is that I don't know if that was</p> <p>19 brought up. And the reason I don't know if that was</p> <p>20 brought up is that I wouldn't have perceived a need.</p> <p>21 But this is a conversation from years ago, so I'm</p> <p>22 doing my best to represent it fully and honestly.</p> <p>23 BY MR. MATHIAS:</p> <p>24 Q. Okay. But there is no doubt you didn't</p> <p>25 specifically tell the University that one of the</p>

62 (Pages 242 - 245)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 246</p> <p>1 articles that was produced by this grant is being 2 used by you in a manner that is to your personal 3 financial benefit. Correct? 4 A. I can't be sure if a sentence to that 5 effect was uttered. But I can tell you, with 6 certainty, that sitting here today I don't perceive 7 that it would be necessary to spell that out. 8 Q. And that's based upon your own judgment. 9 Correct? 10 A. Yes. And my understanding of the 11 system. 12 Q. Okay. Did you tell the University that 13 it's a possibility that some of the individuals that 14 were helping you with this report were using 15 computers owned by Tufts? 16 A. Did I say that that was possible? No. 17 However, I am aware that Tufts' computers should not 18 be used for that purpose. And so I'm aware that the 19 policy is that that shouldn't happen. But since I 20 am not Liz and I am not Chanel, I cannot testify 21 under oath that they followed the policy. But they 22 are aware that the policy is not to use University 23 resources for litigation purposes. 24 Q. And you didn't do anything to ensure 25 that they followed that policy in working for the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 248</p> <p>1 or six years. Is that correct? Do I have that 2 right? 3 A. You do. Yes. 4 Q. Do you happen to know the funding source 5 for that renovation? 6 A. I really don't. I do know the funding 7 source for the new math department building, if 8 you're curious. 9 Q. I'm not. If I told you that the funding 10 source was a Massachusetts State organization 11 intended to issue bonds to support economic 12 development, would you have any reason to disagree 13 with me? 14 A. No. I have no opinions on the matter. 15 Q. Are you aware of the fact that Tufts 16 could have some significant tax issues if it is a 17 conflict of interest for you to be making money 18 through Research Lab, LLC by using either the 19 academic outputs of the MGGG as funded by the NSF or 20 Tufts' computers? 21 MS. ADEN: Objection. 22 BY MR. MATHIAS: 23 Q. Do you have any reason to believe that 24 there could be tax consequences for Tufts because -- 25 well, there could be tax consequences for Tufts if</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 247</p> <p>1 Redistricting Lab, LLC. Correct? 2 A. Well, since I supervise them it is my 3 job to make them aware of the policy, and it's my 4 job to talk through, periodically, with everyone who 5 works for the lab and everyone who works for the 6 LLC, the lines that we draw in order to be sure that 7 we are conducting ourselves with best practices. So 8 we have had that conversation, as a lab, as recently 9 as this summer. That's a conversation I have 10 regularly. But I do not monitor them, if that's 11 what you're asking. I make sure they are aware of 12 the rules and the expectations. 13 Q. Do you happen to know whether or not 14 Tufts is a tax-exempt organization? 15 A. I should maybe know the answer to that, 16 but I don't. 17 Q. Okay. If I represented to you that 18 Tufts is a tax-exempt 501c3 organization, would you 19 have any reason to disagree with me? 20 A. No. I would certainly believe you. 21 Q. Okay. You said you're sitting in Barnum 22 Hall? 23 A. That's right. 24 Q. I assume you're aware that Barnum Hall 25 was renovated extensively within the last maybe five</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 249</p> <p>1 the arrangements we have been discussing, vis-à-vis 2 the grants and Research Lab, LLC are deemed to be a 3 conflict of interest? 4 MS. ADEN: Objection. 5 THE WITNESS: I think you're asking if 6 there could be tax consequences for breaking the 7 conflict of interest policy, and I believe that that 8 would be possible. 9 BY MR. GORE: 10 Q. Okay. And tax consequences both because 11 Tufts is a 501c3 and because the building in which 12 MGGG is located was financed with state bonds? 13 A. This is really beyond -- far, far beyond 14 my expertise. I just simply don't know how the 15 funding of the building has anything to do with -- I 16 just don't know how these -- but I would be happy to 17 find out. 18 Q. Do you think that NSF or Tufts should 19 have been given all of the facts in order to 20 determine if a conflict of interest exists, as 21 opposed to you making a determination that they 22 didn't need to know certain facts? 23 MS. ADEN: Objection. 24 THE WITNESS: I find the question a bit 25 mystifying, but I will attempt to answer it as well</p>

63 (Pages 246 - 249)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

Page 250	<p>1 as I can. I think it is my responsibility to learn</p> <p>2 about the conflict of interest policy and to follow</p> <p>3 it to the very best of my ability. Now, that will</p> <p>4 certainly involve some judgment calls. I don't deny</p> <p>5 that. That's the nature of conflict of interest.</p> <p>6 But I have been quite scrupulous about following the</p> <p>7 rules to the best of my ability.</p> <p>8 BY MR. MATHIAS:</p> <p>9 Q. Assuming that it is a conflict of</p> <p>10 interest that you have engaged in, do you believe</p> <p>11 that Tufts should have been given the opportunity to</p> <p>12 make a determination if it was a conflict of</p> <p>13 interest by being given all the facts?</p> <p>14 MS. ADEN: Objection.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I don't think that</p> <p>16 question makes sense. Can you rephrase it?</p> <p>17 BY MR. MATHIAS:</p> <p>18 Q. Sure. Did you intentionally withhold</p> <p>19 relevant facts from Tufts in order to prevent them</p> <p>20 from making a determination as to whether or not</p> <p>21 you're engaged in a conflict of interest?</p> <p>22 MS. ADEN: Objection.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Thank you for rephrasing.</p> <p>24 That's much clearer. I certainly did not. I</p> <p>25 disclosed all facts I thought to be relevant and</p>	Page 252	<p>1 just --</p> <p>2 A. No. We are talking about hours overall.</p> <p>3 I bill a small fraction of those because I only bill</p> <p>4 the hours that are directly related to the contracts</p> <p>5 that I have signed.</p> <p>6 Q. I understand that concept, for sure.</p> <p>7 You mentioned that your interests in the</p> <p>8 mathematical side of politics, if that's the</p> <p>9 appropriate characterization, began in 2016. Is</p> <p>10 that correct?</p> <p>11 A. Yeah. I would say my research program</p> <p>12 in data and democracy began in 2016. That's right.</p> <p>13 Q. Do you know about when?</p> <p>14 A. Sure. I was teaching a course called</p> <p>15 Mathematics of Social Choice. I guess I don't quite</p> <p>16 remember, I could look it up, whether it was in the</p> <p>17 fall or the spring. But one of those semesters I</p> <p>18 was teaching a Voting Theory course, and that was</p> <p>19 the genesis of the research interest.</p> <p>20 Q. And not the MGGG Redistricting Lab but</p> <p>21 the collective called the Metric Geometry and</p> <p>22 Gerrymandering Group, when did that start, the more</p> <p>23 informal group?</p> <p>24 A. That's when that started. So I took an</p> <p>25 interest while I was teaching this course. I had a</p>
Page 251	<p>1 then some.</p> <p>2 BY MR. MATHIAS:</p> <p>3 Q. What is the Redistricting Lab, LLC's</p> <p>4 monthly revenue, on average?</p> <p>5 A. I have no idea. I really don't know.</p> <p>6 Q. How many clients --</p> <p>7 A. That I can answer. The disclosed</p> <p>8 relationships with civil rights litigation firms and</p> <p>9 with other law firms are -- I have worked with LDF,</p> <p>10 as you heard. I have worked with the Lawyers</p> <p>11 Committee for Civil Rights under law. I have worked</p> <p>12 with Jenner & Block, which is another law firm. And</p> <p>13 I believe those are the only -- I believe, yeah,</p> <p>14 those are -- as I sit here today and with a full</p> <p>15 attempt to be forthcoming, I think those are the</p> <p>16 only clients.</p> <p>17 Q. And you're on leave from Tufts now.</p> <p>18 Approximately how many hours a week do you work for</p> <p>19 Redistricting Lab?</p> <p>20 A. I work too much. I think I recently</p> <p>21 reduced my hourly work from about seventy hours a</p> <p>22 week, which was my average from last summer through</p> <p>23 earlier this year, down to a more manageable, I</p> <p>24 would estimate, fifty hours a week at this point.</p> <p>25 Q. And are we talking billable hours or</p>	Page 253	<p>1 few friends who you can find biographies of on our</p> <p>2 website, namely Ari and Mira originally. And the</p> <p>3 three of us kind of came up with the name and the</p> <p>4 concept of MGGG as an informal collective.</p> <p>5 Justin Solomon, my earlier-mentioned</p> <p>6 collaborator from MIT, joined as a kind of force</p> <p>7 member after a few months, and so we were the</p> <p>8 original four friends thinking about these issues.</p> <p>9 That's what evolved over the span of the next few</p> <p>10 years into the lab that I now direct.</p> <p>11 Q. And when did it become the lab that was,</p> <p>12 I guess, formal or official enough to apply for</p> <p>13 grants and things like that?</p> <p>14 A. Well, again, when I apply for grants I</p> <p>15 do so as an individual. But I often talk about the</p> <p>16 work of the lab as part of it. So you should think</p> <p>17 of the grantee as me in support of the lab.</p> <p>18 Okay. Our first grants to support MGGG</p> <p>19 activities would have been in 2017 when we launched</p> <p>20 a workshop cycle. We had -- I think it was five</p> <p>21 workshops in 2017 and '18 in Boston, Madison,</p> <p>22 Durham, North Carolina, Austin, Texas and San</p> <p>23 Francisco, and some of those were funded by various</p> <p>24 foundations such as the Sloan Foundation.</p> <p>25 Q. Okay. And then the grant that you have</p>

64 (Pages 250 - 253)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 254</p> <p>1 said was the biggest MGGG -- or you had received 2 from MGGG work was in September 2019. When did you 3 begin leave -- or let me rephrase that. How much 4 and when have you been on leave since the end of 5 2019? 6 A. Okay. Let's see. I can try to 7 reconstruct it. So the 2018 to '19 year -- yeah, 8 2018 to '19 year is the year I spent at Radcliffe. 9 So I was on leave, supported by Radcliffe and 10 Guggenheim for projects related to redistricting. 11 After the '19, '20 year I think I was 12 back at Tufts. And yes, I was definitely teaching 13 when the shutdown happened in March of 2020. I was 14 teaching again the following semester. I'm not sure 15 about the spring. I mean, I can look this up if you 16 like. 17 And as I said, I have been on leave all 18 of this academic year. And I'm on leave again the 19 next academic year. So it would be fair to say that 20 I have been on leave as much as I have not over the 21 last few years. 22 Q. Okay. And so you received this grant in 23 September 2019. And you would not have any reason 24 to disagree with me that Redistricting Lab, LLC was 25 formed less than sixty days later. Does that sound</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 256</p> <p>1 purposes I am -- I am the LLC. It's what is meant 2 by doing business as, in my understanding. 3 Q. Okay. If you will bear with me one 4 minute, I have five minutes or less, I just need to 5 pull something up. And I can flip through these. 6 Who is Ben Fifield? 7 A. Okay. Ben is a PhD graduate. 8 MS. ADEN: I'm going to object. I don't 9 think these are the nature of any questions by 10 Mr. Gore. So this is not redirect -- or not 11 redirect. This is not appropriate -- 12 MR. MATHIAS: This is my own -- 13 (cross-talking). 14 MS. ADEN: -- examination of the 15 testimony of Dr. Duchin from direct. 16 MR. MATHIAS: This is my own direct 17 examination of her. That has nothing to do with 18 what I can ask her. 19 BY MR. MATHIAS: 20 Q. Who is Ben Fifield? 21 A. Right. So I believe Ben is a recent 22 PhD. At least he was a PhD student. And I think he 23 received his PhD from Princeton University in 24 Political Science within the last few years. He now 25 works, as I understand it, at ACLU.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 255</p> <p>1 about right? 2 A. I believe you. 3 Q. And then you have been on leave doing 4 seventy or fewer hours a week working for 5 Redistricting Lab, LLC for a large majority of the 6 time since then? 7 A. Just to clarify, for your records, the 8 LLC is what's called -- I don't know if this 9 national or more of a Massachusetts thing, it's 10 called a d/b/a, doing business as. And so the LLC, 11 sort of, is me. There is not a very sharp legal 12 distinction between me, as an individual, and the 13 LLC. So when you say doing work for the LLC, that 14 just means doing work. 15 Q. But you are the sole member of the LLC 16 in Massachusetts called Redistricting Lab, LLC? 17 A. I'm the director. There is also -- at 18 the moment there is another full-time employee and 19 several part-time people who do various hourly work. 20 Q. But all of its income -- all of its 21 profits are attributable to you for tax purposes. 22 Is that correct? 23 A. That's right. That's my understanding. 24 And again, just as I'm not a lawyer, I'm also not an 25 accountant. But my understanding is that for tax</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 257</p> <p>1 Q. Okay. And do you have an LDF email 2 address? 3 A. Do I have an LDF email address? 4 Q. Yes. 5 A. No, I do not, not to my knowledge. 6 MR. MATHIAS: Okay. That's all I have 7 got. 8 MS. ADEN: I have very few because of in 9 the interest of time. I can go directly into it, 10 but Dr. Duchin, if you need a minute I can also give 11 that to you. 12 THE WITNESS: No. Let's roll through. 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION 14 BY MS. ADEN: 15 Q. Okay. Dr. Duchin, do you recall 16 Mr. Gore asking if you have been retained by the 17 ACLU in this congressional phase of the case? 18 A. I don't remember the phrasing, but I 19 remember responding. But I have not been retained 20 through the ACLU. 21 Q. For this case do you understand that 22 ACLU is co-counsel with LDF in the congressional 23 phase of the case? 24 A. Yes, that's my understanding. 25 Q. And you have also worked with ACLU</p>

65 (Pages 254 - 257)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 258</p> <p>1 attorneys in preparing your reports, including for</p> <p>2 this congressional phase of this case?</p> <p>3 A. I'm not sure what "worked with" means.</p> <p>4 I think that -- I think that all the feedback that I</p> <p>5 have received has come from you, but it may well</p> <p>6 have incorporated comments from ACLU attorneys that</p> <p>7 would not have raised my eyebrows.</p> <p>8 Q. Even though you work with some LDF</p> <p>9 attorneys more directly, is it possible your</p> <p>10 retainer agreement is jointly with ACLU, as well as</p> <p>11 LDF as co-counsel?</p> <p>12 A. I see. I apologize if I am not getting</p> <p>13 all the details perfectly. I had the impression</p> <p>14 that it was with LDF, but I agree that it's possible</p> <p>15 that the retainer agreement mentions ACLU. I'm not</p> <p>16 sure about that.</p> <p>17 Q. Dr. Duchin, do you recall Mr. Gore</p> <p>18 asking you questions about the House and Senate's</p> <p>19 separate redistricting criteria?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. In particular, the Guidelines</p> <p>21 documents were discussed extensively -- quite</p> <p>22 extensively.</p> <p>23 Q. And do you first recall Mr. Gore asking</p> <p>24 you questions about your description of first- and</p> <p>25 second-tier criteria in both documents?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 260</p> <p>1 A. I'm sorry. I must be getting tired.</p> <p>2 "Where practical and appropriate, in no particular</p> <p>3 order of preference, are."</p> <p>4 Q. Based on what you just read, do you</p> <p>5 understand these to be second-tier or somehow lower</p> <p>6 in priority than the Roman numeral categories that</p> <p>7 precede it?</p> <p>8 A. Yes, I think that's the clear</p> <p>9 implication of the phrasing.</p> <p>10 Q. And if you look at the House Guidelines</p> <p>11 which have been marked, I believe, as Defendant's</p> <p>12 Exhibit 3 --</p> <p>13 A. Yes.</p> <p>14 Q. -- Roman numeral IX, there is a section</p> <p>15 titled: "Priority of Criteria"?</p> <p>16 A. That's right.</p> <p>17 Q. Okay. And that is the bulk of the</p> <p>18 criteria of the tiers that you were speaking about</p> <p>19 earlier in the deposition?</p> <p>20 A. Yes. That makes, fairly explicit, which</p> <p>21 are the prioritized and which are the less</p> <p>22 prioritized of the criteria.</p> <p>23 Q. So is it fair to say that based upon</p> <p>24 your review, both sets of Guidelines had tiers of</p> <p>25 criteria that you were aware of as you prepared your</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 259</p> <p>1 A. We talked about the phrase "first and</p> <p>2 second tier." I believe I explained my use of that</p> <p>3 phrase with respect to one of the documents more</p> <p>4 than the other. Generally, it was meant to -- I was</p> <p>5 trying very earnestly, in my report, to summarize</p> <p>6 both documents together because they agree in many</p> <p>7 places, even though they differ in a few.</p> <p>8 Q. And if you could look at the Senate</p> <p>9 Guidelines, which I believe have been marked as</p> <p>10 Defendant's Exhibit 4, and turn to Roman numeral</p> <p>11 III.</p> <p>12 A. Yes. I'm doing that now.</p> <p>13 Q. And if you look at Roman numeral III,</p> <p>14 does it read: "ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS"?</p> <p>15 A. That's right. The bold and capital text</p> <p>16 of the heading is: "ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS."</p> <p>17 Q. And do you mind reading the first</p> <p>18 sentence -- or clause that follows?</p> <p>19 A. Sure. It says, quote: "Other criteria</p> <p>20 that should be given consideration, where practical</p> <p>21 and appropriate, in no political order of</p> <p>22 preference, are," and then it continues with A</p> <p>23 through F.</p> <p>24 Q. And I think you said "political." Did</p> <p>25 you mean "particular order"?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 261</p> <p>1 reports?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, I think that is definitely fair to</p> <p>3 say.</p> <p>4 Q. Okay. And do you recall Mr. Gore's</p> <p>5 questions about the use of race in drawing maps?</p> <p>6 A. Broadly, yes.</p> <p>7 Q. And if you look at Roman numeral I B. in</p> <p>8 the Senate Redistricting Guidelines which, again,</p> <p>9 should be Defendant's Exhibit 4 --</p> <p>10 A. Yes.</p> <p>11 Q. -- do you see the first two lines that</p> <p>12 read: "A redistricting plan for the General</p> <p>13 Assembly or Congress must not have either the</p> <p>14 purpose or the effect of diluting minority voting</p> <p>15 strength and must otherwise comply with Section 2 of</p> <p>16 the Voting Rights Act, as expressed through</p> <p>17 Thornburg versus Gingles and its progeny, and the</p> <p>18 Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S.</p> <p>19 Constitution"?</p> <p>20 A. I'm sorry. I have been catching up.</p> <p>21 This is in the Senate Guidelines?</p> <p>22 Q. Yes, Roman numeral II B.</p> <p>23 A. I don't see a II B. in the Guidelines.</p> <p>24 Q. Under B., Voting rights.</p> <p>25 A. So that's I B. Yes, what you just said</p>

66 (Pages 258 - 261)

Moon Duchin , PhD

July 14, 2022

The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 262</p> <p>1 is exactly in there in I B. That's right.</p> <p>2 Q. Then I'm also going to have you look at</p> <p>3 the House Guidelines, Roman numeral II.</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. And can you read the first sentence,</p> <p>6 please?</p> <p>7 A. Yes. It says, quote: "Redistricting</p> <p>8 plans shall also comply with federal law and the</p> <p>9 Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended."</p> <p>10 Q. And can you read the second-to-last full</p> <p>11 sentence of that same paragraph?</p> <p>12 A. Yes, I can. It says: "The dilution of</p> <p>13 racial or ethnic minority voting strength is</p> <p>14 contrary to the laws of the United States and of the</p> <p>15 State of South Carolina, and also is against the</p> <p>16 public policy of this state."</p> <p>17 Q. Now, I'm not asking you for any legal</p> <p>18 determinations, but based upon your experiences and</p> <p>19 expertise and your testimony about having drawn maps</p> <p>20 on other occasions, is it common to look at the</p> <p>21 Black voting age population and other race-conscious</p> <p>22 considerations to develop maps under these</p> <p>23 criteria -- these types of criteria?</p> <p>24 A. In other words, if there is a principle</p> <p>25 against dilution, is it then common to use BVAP,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 264</p> <p>1 Women Voters proposed maps?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, I do remember that.</p> <p>3 Q. And looking at page 10, do you see there</p> <p>4 are deviations of one, two or even three people, as</p> <p>5 compared to the enacted map?</p> <p>6 A. That's right. The top-to-bottom</p> <p>7 deviation of the enacted map is one. And for the</p> <p>8 others -- for the NAACP maps 1 and 2, the</p> <p>9 top-to-bottom deviations are two and four,</p> <p>10 respectively. For Harpootlian and the League it's</p> <p>11 four and five, respectively.</p> <p>12 Q. Based upon your experience of map</p> <p>13 drawing, is it complicated to fix such minimal</p> <p>14 population deviations as those?</p> <p>15 A. I would call it absolutely</p> <p>16 uncomplicated. In fact, I would call it routine.</p> <p>17 And this was discussed earlier in the</p> <p>18 deposition when I mentioned verifying, by hand, that</p> <p>19 it's easy to tune a map with as much as 1 percent</p> <p>20 population deviation, which is much higher than</p> <p>21 this, can easily be tuned -- easily and quickly</p> <p>22 while maintaining its other important measurable</p> <p>23 properties.</p> <p>24 Q. Do you recall Mr. Gore's questions about</p> <p>25 statistical measures of compactness?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 263</p> <p>1 say, as part of map development? Is that the</p> <p>2 question?</p> <p>3 Q. Yes.</p> <p>4 A. Yes, I would say that being aware of</p> <p>5 BVAP is consistent with nondilution.</p> <p>6 Q. And beyond BVAP, you testified that</p> <p>7 there are other race-conscious considerations that a</p> <p>8 mapmaker might be aware of in trying to pay</p> <p>9 attention to nondilution of minority voting</p> <p>10 strength?</p> <p>11 A. Absolutely. I think it's legitimate to</p> <p>12 be aware of various kinds of racial -- race-related</p> <p>13 considerations while pursuing a policy of</p> <p>14 nondilution.</p> <p>15 Q. Dr. Duchin, do you recall Mr. Gore's</p> <p>16 questions about total population deviation with</p> <p>17 respect to a few congressional maps submitted by</p> <p>18 members of the public?</p> <p>19 A. I do. And I think we were talking about</p> <p>20 it as top-to-bottom deviation.</p> <p>21 Q. And if you could look at page 10 of your</p> <p>22 report, your first report.</p> <p>23 A. Yes. I'm doing that now.</p> <p>24 Q. I believe Mr. Gore asked you about the</p> <p>25 Harpootlian South Carolina NAACP2 and the League of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 265</p> <p>1 A. I do recall discussing those.</p> <p>2 Q. Are you familiar with the Maptitude</p> <p>3 software for redistricting?</p> <p>4 A. I am familiar with it. I have, I</p> <p>5 believe, attended one Maptitude training at a</p> <p>6 workshop that I host.</p> <p>7 Q. Are you aware of whether it can run</p> <p>8 programs like statistical measures of compactness?</p> <p>9 A. It certainly can. And I believe I</p> <p>10 recall that the cut-edges measure was added to the</p> <p>11 package in this redistricting cycle.</p> <p>12 Q. And do you have any sense of how long it</p> <p>13 might take to run one or more statistical measures</p> <p>14 of compactness using Maptitude?</p> <p>15 A. I think it's fair to call it</p> <p>16 instantaneous.</p> <p>17 Q. Do you recall Mr. Gore's questions about</p> <p>18 how you reviewed and incorporated public testimony</p> <p>19 collected by the South Carolina Legislature?</p> <p>20 A. I do recall that discussion.</p> <p>21 Q. Do you recall how many hearings you</p> <p>22 reviewed?</p> <p>23 A. I don't have the exact number, but I</p> <p>24 believe we agreed that it would total more than</p> <p>25 1,000 pages of testimony.</p>

67 (Pages 262 - 265)

Moon Duchin , PhD
The South Carolina State Confvs.McMaster/Alexander

July 14, 2022

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 266</p> <p>1 Q. And, in fact, that was a low estimate of</p> <p>2 the number of pages of testimony?</p> <p>3 A. I believe that to be a conservative</p> <p>4 estimate. That's right.</p> <p>5 Q. And that was over many months of</p> <p>6 testimony being collected from the public?</p> <p>7 A. Yes. I described the collection dates</p> <p>8 in my report. And I will just quickly try to find</p> <p>9 that page.</p> <p>10 (Pause In Proceedings)</p> <p>11 WITNESS CONTINUES:</p> <p>12 A. I remember your question. And the</p> <p>13 answer is that the report indicates the meetings</p> <p>14 took place from July through October, considering</p> <p>15 both Senate and House hearings.</p> <p>16 Q. And do you have any reason to know</p> <p>17 whether this testimony is not representative of</p> <p>18 South Carolina communities?</p> <p>19 A. I can't say one way or the other, except</p> <p>20 to repeat what I said before, that it's the best</p> <p>21 data available. It's the best information</p> <p>22 available.</p> <p>23 Q. Do you recall Mr. Gore's questions about</p> <p>24 private criteria being considered by legislators or</p> <p>25 General Assembly that is not available to members of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 268</p> <p>1 Q. This is my last question: Dr. Duchin,</p> <p>2 do you recall Mr. Gore asking you questions about</p> <p>3 circumstances when Democrat -- voters, affiliated as</p> <p>4 Democrats, lose in a Republican-leaning</p> <p>5 congressional district, for example, under certain</p> <p>6 conditions in Congressional District 1?</p> <p>7 A. Yes, I remember discussing that.</p> <p>8 Q. In your reports do you address any</p> <p>9 strategies that may make that outcome likely?</p> <p>10 A. Strategies on the part of the State?</p> <p>11 Q. Yes.</p> <p>12 A. Yes. I look at the effectiveness of the</p> <p>13 plans for the Democratic interests, and I separate</p> <p>14 out the more probative elections for Black voters.</p> <p>15 Q. And did you discuss strategy of cracking</p> <p>16 as one means of trying to effectuate that type of</p> <p>17 outcome?</p> <p>18 A. Absolutely. Cracking is a means of</p> <p>19 diluting the vote and making it more likely that</p> <p>20 certain kinds of voters will not see their wishes</p> <p>21 result in representation.</p> <p>22 MS. ADEN: That's all the questions I</p> <p>23 have.</p> <p>24 MR. GORE: I have one question on</p> <p>25 redirect.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 267</p> <p>1 the public during the redistricting process?</p> <p>2 A. Yes, I recall discussing that.</p> <p>3 Q. Based on your work and exposure to</p> <p>4 principles of good governance, what do you think</p> <p>5 about private criteria being used in a statewide map</p> <p>6 drawing process that is not available to the public?</p> <p>7 A. I would be very surprised if anyone</p> <p>8 described that as a good practice for redistricting.</p> <p>9 Q. Do you have any views of how the public</p> <p>10 would be able to submit maps that complied with</p> <p>11 private criteria that has not been disclosed to</p> <p>12 them?</p> <p>13 A. Except through guesswork, I can't</p> <p>14 imagine how to comply with private criteria.</p> <p>15 Q. What about the same question concerning</p> <p>16 legislators who drew maps but were unaware of</p> <p>17 private criteria?</p> <p>18 A. The answer would be the same, they</p> <p>19 cannot comply with private criteria except through</p> <p>20 guesswork.</p> <p>21 Q. Would maps you drew as alternatives for</p> <p>22 Congress also risk not meeting private criteria if</p> <p>23 you were unaware of those criteria?</p> <p>24 A. That's right. I can only take into</p> <p>25 account the criteria that I am made aware of.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 269</p> <p>1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION</p> <p>2 BY MR. GORE:</p> <p>3 Q. Ms. Aden just asked you about the</p> <p>4 Guidelines and the references, the reference to</p> <p>5 dilution of minority vote strength. Do you recall</p> <p>6 that?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. And do you know what the Guidelines</p> <p>9 definition or standard for dilution of minority</p> <p>10 voting strength is?</p> <p>11 A. It is my recollection that there is no</p> <p>12 definition offered. But in the interest of time, I</p> <p>13 will leave it at that.</p> <p>14 Q. And have you discussed that definition</p> <p>15 with the author of the Guidelines?</p> <p>16 A. I am not aware of who authored the</p> <p>17 Guidelines.</p> <p>18 MR. GORE: Nothing further.</p> <p>19 (The deposition was concluded at 5:50 p.m.)</p> <p>20 (The deponent does not waive reading and signing of</p> <p>21 this deposition)</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

68 (Pages 266 - 269)

69 (Pages 270 - 273)

[& - 202-879-3930]

Page 1

&	139:6 142:15	13 82:1 132:16	139:22,23,25
& 3:4 4:10 10:19 10:22 251:12	143:6 226:2	174:2 175:6	140:1 144:3,5
0	263:21 264:3	217:19 271:13	147:22 165:20
0 272:10,20 273:10,20 03302 1:8	271:10	14 1:23 173:16	165:24 168:8,14
1	10/25 5:12	173:25 174:19	198:14 211:3
1 5:12 10:24,25 20:4 21:2 35:20 36:4,10 37:1,6 42:21 54:4,5 57:14 77:5,12 78:17 89:18,22 113:15 120:19 126:4,18 127:6 127:10,20 128:6 137:15,16 139:25 140:4,6,7 141:24 142:2 144:3,5 147:22 159:2,22 160:20 161:2,15,22 162:2,4 165:4,10 165:15,23 166:3 166:10,19,24 169:3,4,21 202:10 211:3 227:1 264:8,19 268:6 271:1 272:1,11,21 273:1,11,21 1,000 89:8,10 265:25 1.2 30:6 10 128:8,10 133:17 136:25	100 131:6 160:13 161:19 244:6 100,000 127:15 128:1 148:4 234:5 10004 3:21 10006 3:7 104 4:4 10:13 1:24 10th 238:13 11 5:13 26:14 61:8 128:10 133:17 147:25 156:18 198:20 271:11 11th 9:14 26:23 26:25 12 128:10 133:17 151:21,23 162:1 171:3,4 172:20 173:7,22 174:1 175:5 176:14 177:17 179:23 180:9 191:4 192:4 193:24 201:13,20 271:12 12.4 176:12 177:15 12.5 174:7 1221 4:11 125 3:20	15 77:20 88:24 271:15 16 93:2 95:10 99:6 271:16 17 105:12 271:17 18 5:21 106:23 197:18 253:21 271:18 1800 4:11 18th 3:21 197:1 19 108:6 241:8,8 241:24 254:7,8 254:11 271:19 195/24 5:18 196/16 5:19 1965 262:9 197/17 5:21 1998 14:6,8 1a 54:4 1b 54:4	212:19,25 213:14 227:2 261:15 264:8 271:2 272:2,12 272:22 273:2,12 273:22 20 109:7 116:18 117:22 241:8 254:11 271:20 273:15 20001 3:14 2002 204:16 2005 14:11 2010 36:25 38:2 65:10 79:17 217:19,22 218:2 219:5 2011 15:3 2012 54:11 154:6 204:16 2016 15:21 16:1 16:2 252:9,12 2017 253:19,21 2018 60:7 241:14 241:24 254:7,8 2019 36:25 37:21 38:3 233:16,24 238:12 241:6,12 241:14,21 242:1 254:2,5,23 202-879-3930 3:15
		2	
		2 5:13 26:13,14 35:2 36:17 37:3 37:6,7,13 38:7 38:15,25 39:8 40:3 56:15 57:7 58:1 76:6 77:5 77:11,12 78:16 92:11 106:21,24 113:17 126:4 128:3 137:15,16	

[2020 - 5]

Page 2

2020 37:20,22 65:12,16 198:8 217:22 218:2,4,6 219:5,8 241:20 254:13 2021 5:15,16 41:23 49:19 233:17 234:15 2022 1:23 5:13 5:20,21 26:14 154:6 197:2,17 197:18 198:8 270:11 271:3 21 241:11 271:21 21.2 159:23,25 160:20 161:1,6,8 161:15 212-549-2500 3:22 22 124:6 125:20 127:13 128:11 136:25 149:9 241:11 271:22 222/23 5:5 222/5 5:4 23 128:8 139:7 140:2 145:1 154:11 158:1 271:23 23.3 165:10,19 165:22 23rd 270:11 24 144:4 145:10 145:11 154:10 154:11 166:10 271:24 24.4 165:12	24.5 144:14,16 165:13 25 34:1 149:25 157:20 164:20 166:1 168:15 271:3,25 25.4 139:14,22 140:10 142:16 144:1 145:3 161:8 165:20,23 166:12 25.4. 143:21 144:10 145:11 257/13 5:6 26 171:3 26/14 5:14 269/1 5:7 27 172:4,5 176:8 181:11 270 5:8 28 166:3 173:12 173:14 174:20 29 63:21 126:3 141:21 142:4 29201 4:12 2922 270:15 29601 4:5	271:3 272:3,13 272:23 273:3,13 273:23 3.1 44:15 3.2 43:7,11 30 54:14 55:7,10 55:12 56:8 63:21 82:1,5 132:16 141:7,14 141:21 142:1,4 142:20,22,23 148:9,12 271:17 30.3 156:15 300 29:7 30th 234:15 31 90:4 92:11 31st 233:17 33.7 161:16 34 91:16 349 55:6 35 91:16 116:19 36 91:16 3:21 1:8 3b 76:1	273:4,14,24 4.1 52:14 4.2. 56:15 4.3 58:17 61:20 4.3. 59:22 4.4 61:25 62:20 63:12 4.5 66:12 40 3:6 54:16,18 55:11,19 56:4 65:10,17 142:1 41/23 5:15 47.5 154:20 49/19 5:16 4th 9:14 26:23 31:2 35:2 198:7
			5
			5 5:17 35:14 57:5 61:12,18 63:25 67:5 76:24 77:3,5,12 78:20 79:2 92:11 105:12 119:7,12,17,17 137:15,16 139:25 141:14 144:3,5 147:22 154:21 155:5,16 156:13 160:24 161:16,22,23 162:1,2 165:13 181:4 193:12,14 193:16,19,25,25 194:6 271:5 272:5,15,25 273:5,15,25
		4	
		4 5:16,20 49:19 49:23 51:7,9,12 57:4,5,22 63:13 67:7,9 68:17 76:18 89:17 92:11 173:11,14 174:20 180:22 194:1 197:17 211:4 217:7 224:7,8 259:10 261:9 271:4 272:4,14,24	
	3		
	3 5:15 40:14 41:23 42:2 77:8 77:11,21 92:11 94:20 113:17 141:11 191:14 194:12 195:7 201:23 203:16 205:22 211:3 230:24 260:12		

[5.1 - acknowledge]

Page 3

5.1 77:11 89:15 5.2 106:20 5.3. 108:24 50 54:15,17 55:11,16 120:20 501c3 247:18 249:11 51 3:14 5278941 271:5 272:2 273:2 528 55:6 5:50 269:19 6 6 5:18 36:13 77:6,9,22 78:16 78:16,17,20 92:11 108:4 111:5 113:10,21 123:8,11 124:5,5 124:23 137:15 139:2,25 144:3,6 146:6,17 147:3 147:23 149:7,9 150:12 153:7 154:7 155:8,9 158:18 160:22 165:3,5 166:4 167:7,16 191:15 195:23,24 205:16 206:7 231:8 271:6 272:6,16 273:6 273:16 6.1 136:7 137:20 147:18 6.2 147:20 198:20	6.2. 147:8 6/22/2030 270:17 6/3 5:3 63 171:13 173:18 175:3 64 173:21 65 218:6 66 226:5 7 7 5:19 34:1 40:12 108:6 124:4 139:23 144:1,2 145:22 148:20 149:7,22 151:17,24 152:1 152:17 154:5 155:2 158:13 161:13 163:15 164:19 165:13 165:20,24 166:13 167:12 168:8 171:6 173:16 196:13 196:16 231:8 271:7 272:7,17 273:7,17 7/14/2022 271:5 75 157:16 8 8 5:20 59:10 60:16 63:4,11 139:21 143:13 155:19 158:1 173:17,21 184:2 184:5 190:20 197:17,22 271:8	272:8,18 273:8 273:18 803-799-9800 4:12 864-370-2211 4:6 9 9 139:20 143:16 159:19 165:8 166:9 271:9 272:9,19 273:9 273:19 900 4:5 917-858-2870 3:8 92 198:21 199:4 199:18 202:8 962,000 233:16 233:24 962,177 233:7 964,000 233:6 a a.m. 1:24 ability 13:25 85:20 189:19 190:6 250:3,7 able 16:25 26:9 39:22 45:18 108:17 217:23 267:10 absence 162:11 absent 60:10 absolutely 16:21 121:8 132:22 167:15 182:22 238:8 243:1 263:11 264:15	268:18 abstract 178:17 230:3 233:15 234:13,14 236:25 academic 81:6 83:11 84:4,7,18 120:24 225:9,11 226:8 241:8,10 248:19 254:18 254:19 academics 243:25 accelerator 233:3,12 234:6 235:12 236:8 238:7 242:25 accepted 19:7,13 125:3,6 139:4 184:24 accompanied 83:18 138:23,24 account 39:23 88:7 95:3,9 117:14 133:7 152:23 267:25 accountant 255:25 accuracy 271:9 accurate 17:16 79:9 136:10 163:20 270:5 accurately 88:10 acepedaderieux 3:22 achieve 74:4 acknowledge 230:15
---	---	--	--

[acknowledgement - align]

Page 4

acknowledge... 273:3	additions 273:6	adriel 3:20	146:4,11 148:10
acknowledges 107:12	address 17:11	adults 86:24	155:4 163:1,2
acknowledgm... 235:17 271:12	35:8 51:25	advance 15:14	171:2,18 175:21
aclu 10:17,18	67:12 83:22	advantage 59:10	200:2 201:1
256:25 257:17	102:24 108:2	59:15	208:10 258:14
257:20,22,25	164:9 190:11	advice 243:13	259:6
258:6,10,15	257:2,3 268:8	advising 122:6	agreed 143:5
aclu.org 3:22	addressed 34:21	affairs 47:9	155:17 165:11
acres 108:14	42:14,18 69:19	218:14	167:15 265:24
acs 30:9 36:25	69:23 79:21	affect 64:8 65:5	agreement
37:11,19,22 38:1	191:4,22 211:3	98:20	199:19 258:10
39:11,13,17,20	addresses 44:1	affiliate 15:6	258:15
39:23	66:12 107:24	affiliated 223:8	ahead 7:11
act 101:2 188:14	addressing 81:1	268:3	10:23 28:5
188:24 212:20	aden 3:5 5:6 7:5	affiliates 223:15	112:17 126:15
212:22 213:3	7:8 8:25 10:2,13	affiliations	170:13 195:15
261:16 262:9	10:14 91:22	163:12	aimed 79:5,20
active 232:17	103:5 185:16	affixed 270:11	al 271:4 272:1
activities 46:5	186:2 237:22	afraid 237:10	273:1
232:23 243:2	244:24 245:14	age 21:13 36:5	alabama 10:15
253:19	248:21 249:4,23	37:7,9 39:14,15	10:16 17:20
add 28:6 99:11	250:14,22 256:8	39:18 46:12	18:4 19:21 20:2
119:10 120:17	256:14 257:8,14	160:13 262:21	20:25 21:16
131:1 177:23	268:22 269:3	agency 232:5	22:15 53:3
226:6	271:1	aggregated	alexander 1:9
added 226:3	adequate 126:19	142:12	2:3 3:11 6:7
265:10	administration	agnostic 185:19	algorithm
adding 234:10	219:23	ago 10:5,9 13:2	125:12,13,17,23
addition 164:12	administrator	30:20 34:15	126:7 127:1
233:23 243:4	224:24	68:12 96:16	128:19 130:16
additional 57:12	administrators	111:24 113:23	130:17 132:5
97:25 116:19	222:12	115:16 179:8,14	134:3,14 135:12
158:7 181:23	adopt 22:6 23:13	180:17 189:21	135:19 147:1,1
234:5 259:14,16	138:17	190:4 213:24,25	149:11 176:24
	adopted 121:1	223:1,21 232:24	algorithms
	123:18,21	245:21	130:9 230:1,2,7
	adoption 126:21	agree 45:7 55:24	align 157:4,21
		110:20 142:25	

[alleged - approximately]

Page 5

alleged 138:10	27:15,24,24 28:1	ann 90:5	appealing 40:18
allotted 271:20	31:17,18 32:6	annual 240:2	appear 39:19
allow 168:15	61:8,20 62:24	242:9	110:6,11 128:5
177:4 178:3	77:17 84:1	answer 6:24	206:23
allowable 217:1	88:17,18 103:11	7:11,11,18 8:1	appearances 3:1
allowed 104:9	113:11,13 120:3	23:3 28:10	4:1
allowing 236:22	120:4,7,9,13,23	32:18 40:1,10	appeared 230:9
allows 116:8	121:7 123:16	43:19 46:3 84:3	appearing 6:11
185:3 214:6	126:6,24 133:8	84:16,22 85:10	appears 37:3
216:3	136:7,8 149:16	93:16 97:24	63:15 139:13
altered 147:21	150:6,8,14,15,21	101:22 102:3,18	appended 273:7
alternative 20:7	150:24 151:6,13	103:25 108:17	appendix 136:4
23:14 30:12	154:1 155:24	108:25 112:17	193:18
125:1 127:15	158:3,8,21	124:10 125:5	apples 38:1,1
128:1 136:14,15	160:16 163:25	135:9 151:25	applicable 271:8
154:11 155:7	164:9 168:21,25	157:24 161:9	applications
156:13 198:19	178:16 179:13	170:13 185:17	84:11 131:3
198:25 199:9,23	180:3,3,12,14	221:2 223:4	apply 111:9
alternatives	182:15,22 192:4	245:8,17 247:15	113:10 232:13
177:3,23,25	192:5,13 193:3,9	249:25 251:7	253:12,14
267:21	193:14 194:18	266:13 267:18	applying 113:20
amathias 4:6	197:5,6,12 199:9	answered 40:11	appointments
ambiguous	218:19 225:12	146:19 244:25	15:6
220:5	227:3 229:15	answering 95:7	appreciate 22:4
amended 262:9	analyst 224:24	answers 6:24	39:25 70:19
amendment 96:3	analyze 21:16	34:15 75:22	75:19
96:13 178:3	146:7,9 188:24	194:11	approach 135:13
amendments	194:7	anticipatory	appropriate
261:18	analyzed 129:11	86:21	126:8 252:9
american 3:18	213:13	anybody 148:21	256:11 259:21
3:19 36:21	analyzing 52:21	222:19	260:2
37:19	138:17 151:8	anyway 150:25	approved 26:1
amount 31:8	167:6 192:10	apologies 15:13	184:24
226:3	193:24 223:23	138:2 184:17	approximate
analogy 133:22	anchor 141:10	apologize 143:16	19:15
analyses 113:17	anderson 192:18	238:2 258:12	approximately
analysis 12:23	andrew 4:4	appeal 205:12	29:14 251:18
21:2,9 24:20	221:25 222:25	206:3 213:17	

[april - attractions]

Page 6

april 5:13,21 9:14 26:14,23,25 197:1,18 arbitrarily 54:9 area 15:18,20 18:14,20 50:20 84:5 90:8,9 94:22 128:23 137:8 147:8 148:7 areas 15:9,22 35:8 78:2,3,10 78:19 82:2 89:9 154:1 163:21,23 164:8,16 167:22 167:23 168:6,10 170:2 189:13,22 194:13 195:7 221:20 arguably 180:23 ari 253:2 arnold 10:19,22 arranged 114:9 arrangement 118:9 arrangements 249:1 art 136:20 140:18 170:1 174:25 article 230:17,23 231:1,5 235:5 237:7 243:13 245:10 articles 17:2,4 17:10 131:23 223:19 246:1	articulated 100:1,3 203:21 articulation 212:19 ascribing 216:4 aside 139:2 asked 11:16 22:8 34:17 102:24 124:9 146:5 167:18 198:6 243:13,19,25 263:24 269:3 asking 21:24 32:20 45:20 71:16 72:17,19 73:8 88:7 95:7 101:4 104:18 109:6 112:13 151:24 161:6 170:10 181:18 181:22 182:12 191:6 193:3 198:16 247:11 249:5 257:16 258:18,23 262:17 268:2 asks 11:23 12:8 aspect 30:2 188:25 aspects 18:21 28:24 187:20 assembly 25:13 44:11,23 45:11 45:16 47:12,17 47:19 52:20 59:22 60:12 68:25 69:5 73:15 88:5 99:9	101:18 102:16 104:5,13 190:5 208:17 209:15 210:6,15 211:7 212:4 214:12,17 214:24 261:13 266:25 assembly's 67:11 assert 40:8 45:2 45:5 assertion 45:8,8 asserts 216:23 assess 118:24 assessed 56:7 179:4 assessment 188:22 assign 66:6 assigned 66:3,5 198:21 199:5 assigning 66:8 assignment 9:20 97:20 213:15 assignments 98:1 assistance 27:8 28:9 assistant 28:19 28:21 29:1 227:1,2 assistants 27:10 27:19 226:24 227:21 assisting 20:12 association 242:7 assume 7:19 58:6 88:13,16	145:22 247:24 assumed 242:6 assuming 57:12 58:10 228:6 250:9 assumption 155:6,12 157:8 assumptions 12:23 assure 38:17 39:2,5,24 243:8 assuredly 38:21 attached 29:24 271:11 attempt 12:5 28:17 40:17 51:5 54:7 69:3 70:10 132:10,14 146:7,9 249:25 251:15 attempted 11:13 42:16 82:24 attempting 62:18 143:22 151:25 190:11 attempts 216:12 attended 265:5 attention 164:17 263:9 attorney 271:13 attorney's 213:10 attorneys 3:2,11 3:18 4:2,9 25:8 258:1,6,9 attractions 61:19
---	--	---	---

[attributable - believe]

Page 7

attributable 236:4 255:21	85:12 89:24 90:11,24 92:13	127:13 128:11 139:20 140:2	200:14 246:8 260:4,23 262:18
attribute 215:17 235:5	92:14 93:8,22 99:23,25 100:13	143:13 148:24 149:9 154:10	264:12 267:3 baseline 111:8
austin 253:22	100:17,19,22	155:18 158:1,12	124:8,19,21,22
author 217:4 269:15	101:10 102:5 104:4,12 107:5	159:10,19 166:9 172:19 180:22	168:9 207:12 bases 21:10
authored 269:16	107:18,22	181:11 193:17	basic 46:17
authoritatively 125:5	108:20 109:10 109:14,15 111:2	195:15 202:10 203:16 220:3	basis 31:24 32:9 33:2 156:3
authorities 218:11 219:19	120:24 138:16 204:9,12 214:4	221:11 254:12	179:25 180:2,4 237:3,5 243:15
authority 45:6 70:23 208:25 222:8	216:9 217:21 218:1 221:4 246:17,18,22	background 14:2,3,12,15,20 228:5	bcvap 39:15 bear 41:13 77:14 244:12 256:3
authors 208:5	247:3,11,24	balance 97:7,17 97:23 125:22,25	beaufort 91:19 92:8,12 94:11,12
auto 126:25	248:15 260:25	126:7 194:13,13	becoming 53:1
available 13:10 38:4 52:7 85:21 97:13 100:5,25 101:14 177:4,25 193:7 236:24 266:21,22,25 267:6 271:6	263:4,8,12 265:7 267:25 269:16 awkwardly 43:6 71:14	210:20 balancing 97:5 188:14,24	behalf 1:5 behavior 160:11 167:3
avenue 2:1 3:14 110:6	b	ballpark 59:2 91:21	belief 194:18 beliefs 75:12 believe 7:5 8:20 9:14 12:14 18:5 19:13,21 20:16 22:11 23:24 28:2 29:6 31:4 34:10,15 38:9 40:5 44:18 52:15 57:15 60:24 61:2 63:13 68:13 71:16 76:5 77:21 87:22 91:18 93:1,6,21 95:10 96:1,17
average 141:15 202:7 251:4,22	b 5:10 20:4 21:1 49:15 50:7 76:6 90:16 91:19 107:10 109:20 255:10 261:7,22 261:23,24,25 262:1	baodong 150:2 baodong's 150:21	
averaged 58:23	back 23:1 42:21 43:3 50:16 51:3 55:3 59:20,21 60:16 62:3 63:4 63:12 67:6 71:22 88:24 91:3 92:13 105:2,8 113:22	bar 140:14,24 142:3,6,9,13 143:4 148:2	
avoid 57:12 58:9 58:10		barnum 2:1 225:17,19 239:1 239:4 247:21,24	
avoiding 76:11 220:16		bars 142:1	
aware 24:9 29:17 70:23 72:13 73:9,13,14 73:18,19 81:6 83:11 84:25		bartlett 120:20 base 229:2 based 47:9 59:8 60:21,22 62:22 80:5 125:13 182:14 194:8,18	

107:25 111:18	best 13:25 38:19	bit 7:22 20:24	181:15,16 182:9
119:15 132:19	40:11 66:6	28:11 32:16	189:12,14,20,22
143:10 155:7	73:22,25 74:8	35:12 50:21	190:6 191:24
158:24 197:6	75:1 85:20	67:1 71:2	262:21 268:14
198:24 200:11	87:22 88:1,4	115:20 117:1	blindly 177:20
200:24 201:23	97:1 205:6	122:6 125:17	block 58:20
203:14,18 213:8	243:8 244:11	126:2 149:22	59:14 62:11
213:11 219:15	245:22 247:7	150:18 170:1	129:18 251:12
219:18 223:20	250:3,7 266:20	192:20 195:12	blocks 65:8,11
227:24 231:8,20	266:21	204:25 205:9	65:16,19,22 66:3
233:18 234:18	better 24:10	206:19 214:18	66:5,7,8 127:1
235:4 237:6,13	60:18 62:5,8,12	220:5 225:20	bodies 19:18
240:12 247:20	63:16 64:25	249:24	20:12 29:3
248:23 249:7	117:12 125:17	black 21:12	222:7
250:10 251:13	131:15 174:25	22:10,14 34:3,5	body 74:15
251:13 255:2	175:13 183:3	34:18 35:9 36:5	193:19 223:22
256:21 259:2,9	201:3 202:8	39:14,15 46:11	bold 69:1,6
260:11 263:24	210:16 214:1	46:12 52:16,24	259:15
265:5,9,24 266:3	218:25	53:2,18,22	boldface 68:20
belong 59:7	beyond 23:25	105:15,18 108:7	68:23
ben 256:6,7,20	40:19 44:25	111:10,15 114:8	bonds 248:11
256:21	212:21 249:13	114:23 116:4,10	249:12
benchmark	249:13 263:6	116:11,12,13,20	book 83:14
77:10 79:17,22	biden 118:24	116:22 117:6,13	160:18 223:20
90:20 93:5,7,18	152:14	118:22 137:14	boost 127:5
94:12,13 107:2	big 201:9	146:2,3 150:12	borrow 133:22
107:13 108:15	biggest 224:3	151:14 152:5,10	boston 253:21
108:18 109:1	254:1	153:2,9,16,20	bother 109:6
154:7 191:17	bill 252:3,3	154:1 155:21,23	bottom 36:24
199:10,21 201:5	billable 251:25	156:2,6,8,11,20	54:5 56:16,23,25
201:7 217:11,18	billing 29:25	157:3,4,12,16,17	57:3,16 127:18
218:5 221:6	67:13 68:10,16	157:20 158:5,16	171:11 172:19
benefit 184:10	68:24	159:3,8,12,24	173:17 202:11
246:3	binned 142:11	160:5,6 161:20	263:20 264:6,9
berkeley 91:14	bins 140:5 142:7	162:10 169:5,6	boundaries
91:17	142:7,13	169:16 173:25	43:16 47:25
bernard 160:19	biographies	174:15 175:9	48:2,13 49:2
	253:1	177:5,21 178:3	50:14 59:17,18

[boundaries - candidate]

Page 9

64:11 105:17,18 105:19,22 108:7 108:8 134:9 217:7 220:5,7 boundary 202:6 219:10,17 box 141:20,23 boxes 139:9 140:3 141:10 boy 146:18 break 7:23 8:1 50:21,24 51:2 105:1,5,7 148:22 148:23 149:4 195:14,20 222:20 breakdown 195:6 breaking 112:1 127:7,23 249:6 brief 14:22 198:6 briefly 9:15 18:13 77:2 87:1 bright 119:12,16 120:17,18 broad 3:20 18:17 broader 82:11 broadly 114:9 123:20 125:15 261:6 bromley 90:5 bromley's 90:8 brought 6:9 244:12 245:19 245:20	build 124:24 127:9 building 248:7 249:11,15 builds 135:20 bulb 107:25 bulk 141:13 142:24 260:17 bullet 35:3 198:15 200:4 202:10 burden 57:12 58:6,10 bureau 30:9 37:21 65:15 217:25 218:16 burr 4:10 burr.com 4:13 business 120:18 123:3,13 255:10 256:2 buyout 236:16 bvap 36:10,18 39:14 54:14 55:6,10,12,16,19 55:19 56:4,8 77:4 114:14,16 116:18 117:10 117:20,22 137:2 137:19,22 138:12 139:4,13 139:13 140:4 141:7,16,16 143:19,20 144:7 144:8,12,12,18 144:18,19,23,23 144:24 145:25 146:4,10,16,17	146:18 147:3 148:8 156:12 159:22,25 160:21,21 161:1 161:3,3,15,16,23 162:2,7 163:16 165:9,16,22,23 166:9,15,20 167:5,8,14,25 168:2,5,7,12,16 168:19,22 182:20 205:15 206:7 262:25 263:5,6 bvaps 53:25 c c 1:9 3:11 6:17 20:4 21:1 93:2 108:10 271:1 calculate 52:16 173:15 calculation 60:23 calculations 60:19 california 14:25 call 9:1 27:4,21 34:2 36:15 59:7 82:3,16 113:2 124:25 141:13 142:22 190:13 203:5 238:19 264:15,16 265:15 called 15:8,18 18:20 20:3,14 21:12 35:6 36:7	49:14 51:10,20 52:14 61:4 76:1 84:6 111:7,12,24 114:8 121:18 124:15 129:2,7 130:8,16 142:10 191:19 197:10 223:10 225:22 232:9,25 234:1,4 234:25 235:15 237:14 252:14 252:21 255:8,10 255:16 calling 154:6 calls 250:4 campaign 155:22 156:5 158:4 campbell 233:10 233:11 campus 225:15 225:17 campuses 234:7 candidate 114:23 115:7 116:11,13,20 118:25,25 119:9 119:14 120:15 122:22 123:2 151:14,19 153:2 153:10,17 154:18 155:22 156:5,19,21 157:17,22 158:4 158:16 159:3,24 160:5,6 161:15 169:5,7,11,13,17 169:18,22,23,25
--	--	---	---

[candidate - certainly]

Page 10

170:2,5,6,16,18 170:18,19,21 172:1 174:1,3,15 174:19 175:5,9 175:11 177:21 201:18 candidates 114:11,11 115:17 117:6 118:10,22 119:3 119:5 121:19,21 122:2,14 150:13 151:20,21,22 152:5,5,10,11,18 153:21 156:2,10 157:12 159:9,12 161:21 162:3,4 162:10 171:13 175:13 176:5 177:5 178:4 184:23 189:4,25 208:4 capacities 1:18 capacity 1:10,10 1:12,13,14,15 capital 259:15 capture 87:17 88:19 157:23 careful 75:21 164:10 183:19 214:25 215:15 215:17 carefully 32:1 carolina 1:1,3,16 1:18 3:3 4:5,12 5:14 6:10 10:12 13:2 16:11,12,14 17:19,20 18:5	23:17,18 24:4,17 24:20 25:5,11 26:15 29:20,21 30:1 31:14 36:8 42:22,23 44:11 47:1 54:13 60:13 71:17 72:10,14 73:9,17 81:2 82:12 88:12,22 98:9,13 100:15 116:4 120:6 123:9 126:25 131:13 135:18 136:2 150:9 152:6 163:6,21 164:6 170:7 172:17 184:6 204:11 217:21 218:1 219:7,14,16,18 222:8,11,15 239:3 253:22 262:15 263:25 265:19 266:18 270:4,12 271:4 272:1 273:1 carolina's 46:17 carolinians 91:19 carried 111:14 205:6 carry 127:14 cartography 19:22 case 1:8 6:12 9:19 10:1 11:18 12:1,16 13:12 18:4 19:6,9,10	20:25 22:7,25 23:17,18,25 24:5 24:5,12,14 25:10 25:14,18,22,23 26:4,6,18,21 29:19 30:2 31:5 38:21 39:3,6 53:4 60:7 65:19 75:14 99:13 105:4 125:4 127:3 129:4 131:13 138:13 138:19 150:4,24 152:22 153:16 153:24 166:18 182:15 188:22 197:5,9 205:10 205:12 211:17 213:17 214:12 216:8,8,10 223:3 227:11 228:24 229:4 230:19 244:11 257:17 257:21,23 258:2 cases 17:13,21 17:22,25 19:1 20:6 22:18,22 77:17 85:6 125:8 204:10 218:12 cast 19:14 178:13 catch 70:18 205:21 catching 261:20 categories 260:6 category 12:4 48:12 52:19	53:19 causal 183:10 cause 270:8 caveat 75:19 cayce 108:13 cd 77:22 106:24 156:13 191:15 205:15 206:7 cemeteries 110:19,21 cemetery 110:6 110:7,13,16 census 30:8,9 36:11 37:12,18 37:21 38:4,8,16 39:1,9,12,21 40:4 65:8,10,11 65:12,15,16 66:8 110:17,24 217:25 218:4,16 218:17 225:1 232:9 233:4 centered 25:16 cepeda 3:20 certain 30:7 80:23 87:18 113:16 115:8 125:12 129:19 132:11 168:19 181:14 182:2 199:19 249:22 268:5,20 certainly 12:14 47:5 52:10 53:10,23 61:18 68:1,7 71:2,21 80:11 81:16 86:20 87:5
--	--	--	--

[certainly - clarify]

Page 11

88:22 89:9	238:21 239:3	checking 93:25	chose 39:4
98:24 117:10,13	246:20	116:1	143:11 244:22
122:12 128:20	chanel's 228:24	cherry 38:18	chosen 38:23
133:5 135:24	change 25:16,18	39:24	54:9 169:18
140:6 151:23	36:24 142:13	chicago 14:9,11	191:22
152:4 162:20	218:11,24 222:8	14:24	chris 1:12
193:7,20 205:1	233:16,24 272:4	choice 15:23	chunks 77:25
206:9 212:15	272:7,10,13,16	37:16,17 114:11	78:9 82:17
215:1,2,18 229:1	272:19	114:23 115:8,18	circulating
240:7 247:20	changes 36:18	116:12,14 117:7	216:12
250:4,24 265:9	78:14 133:15	118:23 150:13	circumstances
certainty 40:9	201:9 218:13	151:14 152:5,10	37:15 72:5
123:6 246:6	271:10 273:6	154:19 156:3	268:3
certificate 5:8	chapter 83:14	157:12,17,22	cite 122:3
270:1	characterization	161:21 169:5,7	cited 79:6 92:11
certified 270:2	68:24 162:24	169:12,14,17,23	203:6 235:17
270:17	252:9	169:25 170:3,6	cities 48:20 63:3
certify 270:4,7	characterize	170:18 174:15	63:24 79:6
certiorari 24:6	14:12 135:3	175:9 177:6,21	106:4,6,10,13,15
cetera 202:9,9	240:16	178:4 184:23,25	130:19
chain 129:2,14	characterizing	189:4 190:1	citing 133:1
224:4 235:16	88:2 163:8	208:4 252:15	citizen 39:15,18
chains 129:3	164:2	choices 89:2	city 63:22 64:16
230:20 231:12	charleston 79:8	189:1	64:23 181:1
235:3 236:10	89:1 93:4,10,10	choose 39:20	civic 15:7 223:9
237:15	105:17,17,24	59:4 101:24	civil 3:18,19
chair 192:17	106:2 163:17	129:20,21	251:8,11
chairman 1:11	164:4,12 166:22	130:10,12	claim 155:20
1:13,14	166:23 167:1	132:17 137:10	156:3 184:19
challenge 6:9	189:12 194:5	208:13,17 209:8	claiming 74:16
25:12	chart 55:15	209:15,25 212:7	clarification
challenged 23:19	148:2 171:4,11	choosing 130:9	142:14 153:1
137:17	173:17 195:5	choropleth	164:11
challenging	charts 151:18	35:20,22,24,25	clarified 120:21
82:15 145:5	check 19:23	89:16,17	clarify 7:16
chance 115:18	133:7 220:20	choropleths	12:19 25:24
chanel 228:2,18	230:25 231:9	36:14,16 46:10	72:16 74:21
228:18,21	233:19		82:11 101:6

[clarify - communities]

Page 12

110:8 114:7 137:4 218:7 226:7 227:4 255:7 class 59:7 classic 130:16 classify 26:4 clause 259:18 clear 31:7 42:6 67:18 74:16 82:9 83:7 98:11 100:18 113:14 116:9 124:10 137:25 152:20 161:18,19 164:23 167:1 168:10 175:12 185:8 196:22 204:21 228:17 232:13 260:8 clearer 135:7 250:24 clearest 56:23 189:8 clearly 41:8 44:19 53:5 87:16 118:21 184:9 207:22 208:14 clients 251:6,16 clifford 1:17 close 121:21 122:3,18 159:15 173:22 closely 129:18 cluttered 143:11 clyburn 108:5 123:11	coastal 92:25 94:23 192:18 coastlines 59:19 code 27:23 226:21 228:14 229:1 230:2,5 coding 228:19 coexist 168:16 cognizant 94:16 95:11,13 98:15 cohesively 113:5 coi 109:8 132:13 133:14,20,21 coincidence 181:19 cois 48:13 82:3 82:17 93:1 94:17 95:12 133:6,9 207:19 collaborations 230:7 collaboratively 230:16 collaborator 253:6 collaborators 51:16 229:23 collect 12:3,11 87:24 collected 13:16 80:14,15 265:19 266:6 collection 66:25 111:14 134:12 223:12,17 266:7 collections 124:25	collective 252:21 253:4 collectively 185:22 collects 80:16,18 college 15:7,8 223:9,10 224:23 228:9 colleton 93:15 93:16,18,23,24 94:2 colleton's 93:20 colored 78:2 colorful 78:8 columbia 1:2 4:12 78:25 79:7 88:25 107:10,19 107:23 108:11 108:13 163:18 164:5,12 189:12 column 54:18 56:7,16 64:24 combination 115:8 157:2 176:4 come 59:18 63:12 99:5,17 102:21 103:1 150:5 164:13 199:3 258:5 comes 17:8 18:14 51:24 107:24 123:7 164:15 220:3 221:11 239:6 comfortable 164:2	comfortably 122:16 coming 39:25 61:19 83:23 comment 86:15 commenters 83:4 86:12,15 92:10 comments 21:24 83:3 258:6 commission 1:16 1:18 20:14,15,17 23:6 86:3 270:17 committee 1:11 1:13 45:5 251:11 common 120:8 142:11 172:16 177:20 218:22 244:19 262:20 262:25 commonly 203:20 communications 12:6,9 13:22 37:22 communities 35:9 43:15 47:25 48:1,15 49:1 62:24 63:9 70:20 71:22 73:16,23 74:11 74:14 75:6 79:6 79:12,14,16,24 80:23 81:9,10,14 81:20,24 82:21 83:21 84:2 85:7
---	--	--	---

[communities - conclusion]

Page 13

85:19 87:8,13 88:3,21,25 89:4 95:15 98:19,23 132:11,13,17 133:1 188:1 191:24 217:7 266:18 community 30:13 36:22 37:19 70:25 71:4,8,10 72:15 74:20 75:13 84:14 90:7 91:5 91:9 92:9,24 94:4 96:4 224:5 compact 98:21 107:17 129:17 129:20,21 132:7 compactness 43:15 47:24 49:2 58:17,20 59:7,24 60:4,19 60:21 61:5,8,10 61:13,17,20 62:3 77:7 98:7,20,22 99:1 128:13 129:12,23,24 131:25 149:13 180:23 188:9,18 188:19 211:18 264:25 265:8,14 company 227:6 comparable 131:15,19 202:14 comparably 202:20	comparative 136:22 comparator 207:12,24 compare 55:3 136:13 174:11 199:13 compared 39:3 111:7,15 124:7 124:19,21 126:3 146:14 151:21 191:6 199:10 207:11 264:5 compares 149:17 199:21 200:18 comparing 184:5 comparison 38:1 140:11 199:14 199:15,16 202:25 203:1 219:11 comparisons 179:21 compelling 33:4 231:18,20,21 compensated 29:7 227:16 242:23 compensation 29:24 240:25 competing 208:11 complaint 137:13,18 complement 174:8 188:12	complete 28:10 46:4 66:4 75:22 83:9 96:9 132:23 194:11 270:5 273:8 completed 95:24 271:17 completely 37:16 139:4 162:6 245:3 compliance 210:7,16 211:9 227:12 complicated 74:15 75:6 219:1 234:3 264:13 complied 267:10 comply 57:8 60:10 261:15 262:8 267:14,19 component 78:4 225:21 components 78:4 231:17 comprehensive 28:18 compromise 41:9 178:2 compromised 37:23 computational 18:18 27:25 129:6 134:23 226:21 228:14 236:13 computer 25:4 179:4 228:3	239:12,16,20 computers 246:15,17 248:20 computing 228:4 concede 70:9 87:16 115:23 205:1 conceded 183:20 concentrated 15:10 163:22 concentrating 184:21 concept 121:10 121:16 132:13 133:4,20 230:8 252:6 253:4 conceptual 115:22 conceptually 130:5 concern 34:5 concerning 267:15 concerns 33:15 33:21,23 34:9,15 34:20,25 188:1 192:9 conclude 31:23 33:5 70:6 181:13 concluded 235:13 269:19 conclusion 32:1 32:4,12 33:4 131:18 179:22 182:7 183:1 184:1,3 191:25
--	---	--	---

192:3,8	244:22 245:11	221:12 262:21	210:17 211:10
conclusions	248:17 249:3,7	263:7	213:4 220:17
33:12,13 64:22	249:20 250:2,5,9	consensus 66:4	259:14,16
80:5 115:15	250:12,21	consequence	262:22 263:7,13
182:13	conflicted 75:15	158:9	considered
conclusive 185:7	conflicts 240:3	consequences	42:12 48:14
conclusively	confused 157:6	248:24,25 249:6	71:4 74:11
32:21	241:9	249:10	76:15 102:25
concurrent	confusing	conservative	112:7 117:2
235:9	150:18	89:12 266:3	157:18 188:3
conditions	congress 136:3	consider 20:18	205:1 266:24
178:19 268:6	261:13 267:22	23:13,14 69:5,9	considering 69:1
conduct 61:8	congressional	69:12 73:5	100:14,23
113:17 150:7	5:14,15 13:3	82:17 98:22	101:10,18
conducted 88:17	23:20 24:4	102:19 104:9	102:17 104:5
129:2 154:3	25:12 26:15,22	125:12 134:18	177:19 187:15
199:22	29:21,24 30:11	135:14,19,22	189:11 192:23
conducting	31:14 41:24	147:4 151:2	221:12 266:14
247:7	42:10 44:24	156:23,25	consistency
conference 1:3	51:10 57:13,24	considerable	49:15 50:8 76:2
3:3 74:7 271:4	58:1,11 126:20	87:23 156:9	76:6 204:19
272:1 273:1	135:18 151:3,8	considerably	consistent 263:5
confidence 126:6	151:12 184:6	175:15	consistently
127:5,11	189:15 220:18	consideration	140:20
confident 29:19	227:25 257:17	46:24 49:8 61:3	consonant
243:10	257:22 258:2	69:25 71:15,20	214:23
configuration	263:17 268:5,6	72:4,21 73:10	constant 178:21
168:15	congressman	99:24 211:25	178:24
confirm 46:1	123:10	212:6 259:20	constituent
133:12 147:10	connect 114:19	considerations	49:15 50:8 76:1
147:11 184:4	connected 15:22	23:22 34:8 49:6	76:6 204:18
200:25	24:20 78:3,4	49:7 61:14	constituents
conflict 42:12	connection 6:8	67:17 69:4,22	76:11
69:17 207:20	6:12 12:1,10	101:4 102:21	constitute 75:12
211:5,14,17	121:16	103:1,24 168:24	140:22
226:12 227:12	connects 137:16	176:23 187:21	constitutes 141:2
239:25 240:9,16	conscious 214:8	188:8 206:22	195:3
240:21 242:3,21	214:14 221:1,10	207:13,18	

[constitution - correct]

Page 15

constitution 43:9 213:2 261:19 constitutional 42:22 constitutive 112:7 construct 32:11 48:6 constructed 43:6 120:1 167:20 construction 169:14 consulting 226:9 227:6 240:19 245:2 contacted 9:25 contain 65:8 149:16 contained 45:4 67:10 contains 167:2 contemplate 44:19 115:3 contemplated 207:7 contemplates 116:6 contend 82:13 contention 97:2 119:14 contest 151:11 170:8 contests 76:11 154:19 171:19 context 20:13 46:21 119:11 125:7,10 138:8,9 138:9 146:2	187:24 229:22 contextualize 40:18 contiguity 43:15 47:24 49:2 125:23 contiguous 66:9 continue 185:18 continues 259:22 266:11 continuous 27:4 contour 59:8,11 contours 46:18 contracts 252:4 contrary 262:14 contrast 151:21 contravened 184:25 contravenes 184:8 186:14 187:19,22 188:11 contravention 184:13,14 contributes 162:14 control 25:25 138:4,7 controversial 71:10,12,21 convened 20:15 convergence 233:3,12 234:6 235:12 236:8 238:7 242:24 conversation 218:8 245:21 247:8,9	conversations 96:10 conveyed 185:13 convince 126:17 copied 224:14 copies 11:23 12:8 271:14 copy 26:11 29:2 29:4 41:18 49:25 52:7 cora 228:2,6,12 228:17 core 67:14,16,19 67:20 68:22 69:12 71:3 72:7 76:11,21 199:8 199:19,23 200:1 201:9,24 202:2,7 202:21 203:3,9 203:11 204:6,7 205:12 206:3 208:12 209:20 210:1,21,23 213:17 214:7,13 215:3,19 216:15 221:18 231:14 cores 49:13 50:11 70:24 72:2,14 73:5,11 73:16 74:10 75:24 76:3,19 99:1 135:14 188:2 201:5 203:2 204:23 206:22 209:7 211:19 220:25 221:8	corpus 28:19 correct 6:12,20 21:5 23:2,7,8 24:7 26:7 30:5 31:15 36:20 37:10 40:4,7,14 40:17,20 42:20 47:14 50:15 52:18 54:12,15 56:5 57:15 58:3 58:15,16 61:23 62:12 63:11 68:14 70:15 72:12 73:1 76:7 78:16 82:8 87:4 100:3 102:9,11 106:5 107:11,14 109:9,17,18 137:4 139:10 141:3 144:15,25 145:3,9 146:14 146:21 147:6,24 148:17 150:8 151:10,19 152:19 153:4,5 153:10,13 154:9 155:14 156:16 156:20 158:23 158:25 159:13 160:2 164:6 165:13,20,24,25 166:8 167:9,14 169:5,8,12 170:25 171:21 174:17,20 175:6 175:11 179:12 181:9 194:23 195:1,7 197:3,9
---	--	--	---

[correct - criteria]

Page 16

198:2 199:2	12:6,10,14,16	98:11,12 99:7,7	covering 240:7
201:19 210:24	13:9,11,18,23	105:19,24 106:7	covid 37:23
217:18,19	30:20 66:20	106:16 107:2,7	234:7
225:10 226:18	88:23 95:20	130:20,23 131:5	cracked 138:11
230:22 231:15	96:6 118:21	131:7,10,14,19	145:14
231:21 232:2,6	149:24 150:14	181:2 192:16	cracking 111:12
233:14 237:20	150:16 242:14	270:12	111:24 112:4,11
238:7,24 240:7	242:17,20 243:5	couple 11:22	112:15,22,25
241:18 244:23	257:22 258:11	34:14	113:3,7,8,24,25
246:3,9 247:1	270:8 271:14	course 25:7 27:7	124:15,17,20
248:1 252:10	count 16:6,25	46:15 123:21	137:21 138:3,9
255:22 273:8	21:7 37:6 55:21	221:14 229:25	138:11,15,17,23
correction	56:10 78:6 83:3	237:18 252:14	138:25 139:3
198:11	116:24	252:18,25	146:7 167:6
corrections	counted 155:13	courses 236:17	199:1 268:15,18
273:6	counterparts	court 1:1 6:10,22	create 189:18,19
correctly 26:4,8	175:14	6:23,25 15:14	created 241:19
35:21 49:22	countervailing	17:24 18:3,4,7	creating 27:22
59:1 64:1 76:13	183:8	18:23 19:3,6,11	creation 34:6
140:3 182:11	counties 35:7	21:16,19,21 22:6	37:15 115:17
184:12 196:13	48:19 63:2,6	22:16,23 24:5	205:16 206:8
197:21 202:4,18	90:8 94:25 99:8	25:15 42:24	creative 168:15
213:22 236:2	100:4 106:11,13	53:4,20 60:6,10	credible 21:23
correlates 168:5	128:15 130:2,19	71:6 84:25	credit 235:20
correlation	130:20,21,25	85:13 99:13	criteria 5:15
88:14,16	131:9 132:8	115:21 117:2,12	33:18 34:11,16
correspondence	134:9 149:13	123:18,21 125:4	40:13,15,22 41:3
178:14	191:20 200:6	125:6 138:16	41:23 42:4,7,11
corroborates	country 64:12	157:19 184:11	43:1,3,8,22 44:7
155:20	65:11 98:14	184:18 213:6	44:8 45:6 48:6
cost 96:25 99:5	154:1 218:23	231:20	49:4 67:10 68:7
102:21 103:1,8	222:13	court's 53:18	68:10,16 69:6,10
233:18	county 36:18,23	courts 85:6,19	69:13,15,17 70:7
costs 225:22	63:2,16,17 89:20	115:12 139:5	75:24 99:9,14
coterminous	89:21 90:1,13,17	140:21 244:13	100:9,14,24,25
112:4	91:1,5,8,14,17	cover 140:3	101:14,15,19
counsel 2:3 3:1	92:8,14,20 93:15	covered 78:21	104:15 111:17
4:1 8:16 11:24	93:18,23,24	184:3	136:15,17

[criteria - defined]

Page 17

148:14 149:18 183:25 209:1,14 211:23 216:15 258:19,25 259:19 260:15 260:18,22,25 262:23,23 266:24 267:5,11 267:14,17,19,22 267:23,25 criterion 100:24 102:8,15 103:12 104:6,14 211:24 critical 231:4,13 criticized 19:2,5 cross 157:21 159:16 222:5,23 256:13 257:13 crossover 115:3 116:6,9,9 138:12 157:4,11,24 160:1 162:11,17 163:19,21,22 164:3,6 166:24 167:23,24 169:11,13 cs 271:15 cumulative 54:10,21 55:13 curation 27:21 226:21 228:13 curious 34:19 248:8 current 16:8 103:22 219:20 241:10 currently 70:12	curriculum 5:18 195:24 cusick 3:6 8:25 cut 58:21 59:14 62:11 122:11 129:9,18 130:23 131:8 210:10 211:23 265:10 cutoff 140:21 cutting 204:8 cv 1:8 16:6,7,8 17:15 196:4,6 cycle 86:3 125:8 253:20 265:11 cyndi 4:16 d d 5:1 6:17 20:4 21:2 105:23 255:10 d.c. 3:14 darryl 230:11,11 data 12:23,25 13:1,8 20:13 23:10 25:8 27:16,21,22 30:8 30:18,19,22 36:9 36:11 37:11,12 37:18,20 38:4,8 38:16,20 39:1,9 39:11,12,13,17 39:21 40:4 44:20,23 46:7,8 46:10,14 51:23 51:25 52:3,5 66:19 67:3 80:17 82:15 83:8 110:17,24	133:25 134:1,13 134:18 135:2 142:5,12 186:20 192:13,25 193:7 193:23 194:2,8 195:1,2,6 217:25 218:4 219:10,20 221:13 225:1,12 226:20 228:13 228:19 230:10 232:9,25 233:4 252:12 266:21 database 219:13 date 1:23 10:9 29:15 196:23,24 219:17 233:15 233:17 238:9,17 272:24 273:12 dated 5:21 9:14 26:23 196:23 197:18 198:7 dates 238:11 241:9 266:7 daubert 245:5 davis 14:25 day 1:17 3:13 6:6 9:4 25:2 270:11 273:15 days 254:25 271:17 deal 28:16 236:12 debate 96:12 debated 86:4 decennial 36:11 37:12 38:4,8,16 38:21 39:1,9,12 39:21 40:3	decided 48:21 86:5 decimal 53:25 54:2 decision 22:1 53:4,18,20 131:12 190:21 191:10 221:1,4,7 221:8 244:21 245:9 decisions 70:24 74:16 84:25 191:1,12,16,19 192:7,8 214:8,14 215:11 declare 273:4 declined 16:18 16:19 decode 15:15 decoupled 72:5 deemed 249:2 273:6 deeper 20:21 defend 145:17 defendant's 259:10 260:11 261:9 defendants 1:19 4:2,9 5:12 6:7 10:25 223:2 defended 7:4 defense 3:4 10:13 define 111:12 114:4 118:17 123:10 124:11 defined 64:14 118:8
---	--	---	---

defines 119:17	159:6 170:11,15	department	170:17 191:23
definitely 38:6	170:21 268:3	235:14 248:7	204:5,7 231:3
52:9 66:11	democratic	depend 114:25	234:3 240:18,19
100:7,12 114:15	151:19,20,22	depending	242:10
122:24 145:12	152:2 169:22	157:22 160:10	described 44:4
153:24 161:9	171:12,13 172:1	229:22	46:6 56:20 59:8
219:25 221:20	174:3 175:5,10	depends 65:24	126:2 131:22
236:6 240:1,6,8	179:24 192:17	103:7 135:4,10	135:11 136:5,22
242:8 254:12	201:15,18	142:6 160:8	154:16 183:14
261:2	268:13	205:4	203:24 204:10
definition	democrats 152:3	depict 37:3 54:5	206:23 230:8
113:20 114:7,13	152:11 153:21	depicted 36:4	231:4 266:7
114:16 115:2	159:9 163:6,8	54:25	267:8
116:5,17 117:4,9	172:22 174:6,7	depicting 36:17	describes 235:10
117:11,18,19,25	268:4	37:1	describing 39:20
118:2,4 119:19	demographic	deponent 269:20	47:9 123:25
119:23,24 120:2	21:9 47:1 54:9	271:13 273:3	183:10 214:25
120:13 121:1	114:21 137:1	deposing 271:13	description
122:20 123:19	178:8	deposition 1:22	136:4 216:7
123:21,23	demographics	5:12 7:5 8:14	258:24
124:12,17 269:9	52:15,16 53:13	9:10 11:1,11,11	descriptions
269:12,14	demography	12:2 17:18	61:11
deford 230:11	19:22	149:3,23 195:19	design 190:22
defray 225:22	demonstrably	229:25 260:19	244:9 245:3
defreitas 2:4	179:9	264:18 269:19	despite 161:23
270:2,16	demonstrated	269:21	163:16 166:19
degree 14:10	184:20	depressed 168:7	detail 14:23
123:24 228:3	demonstration	depression	30:22 35:12
degrees 14:7	20:5 97:21	138:11	126:2 128:21
delayed 37:18	demonstrative	derieux 3:20	129:25
deliberately	13:6 20:3,7,18	derived 149:20	detailed 76:24
215:16	21:1 23:13	150:2	84:22 85:1
delineated 82:25	24:21 113:15	describe 14:3	182:19
delivery 67:4	195:4	18:13 32:21,22	details 47:15
democracy	density 109:24	41:5 43:20,20	126:12 258:13
252:12	deny 94:9	45:18 77:2	determination
democrat 151:15	134:11 250:4	109:11 123:14	60:19,23 90:23
153:3,12,17		126:10 161:11	249:21 250:12

[determination - discussed]

Page 19

250:20	different 38:18	dimensional	267:11
determinations	38:22,23 39:4,5	15:13	disclosure
262:18	46:5 48:18 53:6	diminishes 114:2	243:21
determine 36:9	53:15 54:24	direct 6:3 63:10	discount 107:8
44:7 45:6 68:15	56:21 62:14	147:4 191:2	107:20
82:21 97:17	72:20 82:7 88:7	209:25 210:6,14	discreet 15:16
111:9 113:11	97:3 114:22	211:7 212:4	27:6
120:14 158:3	130:19 136:20	253:10 256:15	discrete 54:24
167:13 207:25	136:21 138:22	256:16	59:15
208:25 249:20	142:9 151:11	directed 15:19	discretion 60:11
determined 83:5	152:15 182:21	164:1 210:2,22	discriminates
194:14	206:21 211:23	211:17	31:24 32:9,15
determining	236:23	direction 22:12	33:2
140:15	differently 130:4	227:3	discuss 35:6
develop 117:11	163:11	directions	40:13 44:10
262:22	difficult 80:18	211:23	68:8 105:4
developed 51:16	96:18 182:24	directive 60:11	121:13 147:12
development	difficulty 37:20	60:13	149:2 163:15
248:12 263:1	diffused 163:24	directly 12:15	195:18 200:4
deviates 106:15	dilute 112:23	252:4 257:9	268:15
deviation 56:13	diluted 179:9	258:9	discussed 8:17
56:17,20,25 57:4	dilutes 111:9	director 1:16	9:20 13:5,18
58:7 126:4,10,19	diluting 112:23	233:11 255:17	20:7 28:19
126:22 127:4,10	182:9 261:14	disaggregated	43:21 47:16
127:18 128:3	268:19	171:16	53:3 54:7 61:17
263:16,20 264:7	dilution 111:7	disagree 236:7	63:2 74:9 76:18
264:20	111:19,22 112:5	247:19 248:12	76:21 82:22,25
deviations 57:14	112:8,12,15	254:24	85:13 96:3
57:20 58:12,15	113:1,4,11,19,20	disambiguate	99:17 100:16
264:4,9,14	118:4 124:3,7,11	72:7 103:14	107:21 121:1
dial 131:9	124:13,14,18,19	216:24	124:14 126:21
differ 66:2 259:7	137:14 138:18	discerning 185:5	129:19 132:19
difference 57:18	167:7,17 181:15	disclose 242:19	141:20 147:15
101:14 147:17	262:12,25 269:5	244:15,23	148:16 160:22
219:7	269:9	245:12	162:7 181:3,9
differences	dilutive 113:9	disclosed 104:6	191:1 197:16
115:23 209:19	214:8	242:4,5 244:5	204:20 205:19
		250:25 251:7	212:13 215:6

[discussed - divided]

Page 20

217:3 223:21	distinctive	139:23 140:1,16	25:12,13 26:15
237:4,4 258:21	194:20	141:16 143:20	26:22 29:24
264:17 269:14	distinguish	144:1,2,8,12,18	42:10 49:14
discusses 43:23	220:14	144:19,23,24	50:11 54:1,8,14
76:9 83:12,15,16	distorting	146:16,17,18	54:19,23,24,25
84:19 89:9	133:10	147:2,3 148:8	55:10,12 57:24
discussing 41:20	distributed	152:19 153:7	58:1 59:17
50:2 84:25	111:15	154:7 155:8,9,16	70:24,25 72:2,15
96:16 136:18	distributing	155:21 156:20	72:23 73:5,16
147:14 157:3	138:5	157:5,23 158:18	75:24 76:3,10,19
209:18 213:3	distribution	159:2,22,25	77:5,12,14 78:15
226:7 231:6	134:25 135:4,5	160:2,20,21,24	81:2 93:11
249:1 265:1	139:9 146:10	161:1,2,3,15,16	112:2 114:10
267:2 268:7	148:1 178:9,12	161:21,22 162:1	117:21 122:13
discussion 49:17	179:6	162:2,2,3 165:4	122:15,17 123:1
61:10 67:14	district 1:1,1	165:5,5,10,13,13	123:6 129:9,10
74:10 81:5,7	6:10,10 13:4	165:15,16,23	130:7 135:23
104:25 170:9	18:3 22:10,13	166:3,4,7,10,13	137:2,11 139:25
194:16,17	29:21,22 33:6	166:16,19,24	144:3,9 146:3
201:16 222:21	45:11 53:4,17,20	167:2,8,12	147:17,19,21,22
265:20	55:15,19 56:4,8	168:14 169:3,4	154:11,15
disfavor 101:25	65:22 66:9 71:3	169:21 170:11	158:17 159:13
dismiss 99:18	71:4 74:10	170:15,22	163:14 165:9
216:19,23 217:4	76:24 77:5,9	182:19 188:2	166:20 167:20
disparate 217:2	79:2 89:15,18,22	193:24,25	168:8 171:17,19
dispersed 138:6	105:18,22	209:20 211:19	171:22 175:4
205:14 206:5	106:15,21	268:5,6	178:18 189:18
213:19,22	107:25 108:4,8	districting 24:1	198:22 199:6
dispersing	114:14,25 115:6	24:17 33:18	201:5 203:20
184:21 187:5,9	115:17 116:17	34:11 57:13	205:14 206:6
189:2 208:6	116:19,21,24	74:2 94:21	213:19,19
displaying 49:23	117:3,8,24 119:3	125:1 134:19	220:25 230:18
dispute 238:10	119:4 122:21	136:12 184:7	divergence 48:4
disregarded	123:8,11,15	202:16 204:23	diverse 221:21
93:1	136:24 137:11	220:2,9 231:10	divide 41:3 42:4
distinct 220:11	137:12,15,18,22	districtr 224:5	64:18
distinction	138:10,13,24	districts 5:14	divided 40:22
255:12	139:2,13,17,22	21:5,11 23:21	94:3 114:2

[division - easier]

Page 21

division 1:2 44:9 44:10 227:5 divisions 50:13 63:1 doc 224:19 doctor 173:5 doctoral 14:24 document 11:12 11:16 22:1 44:4 45:2,4,5 50:1 196:2,3,19 240:14 documentation 235:24 documents 9:9 9:12 11:17 12:3 12:12,13 13:16 13:19,21,24 50:2 99:13,17 189:6 216:11,16 258:21,25 259:3 259:6 doing 10:1 73:20 112:18 121:5 158:20 215:22 225:9,10,12 228:10 230:4 242:18 245:22 255:3,10,13,14 256:2 259:12 263:23 dollar 232:8 233:2 dollars 234:11 domain 84:4 donation 231:24 dorchester 90:17 90:19,25 92:14	92:15,20 99:7 192:16 dot 58:10,10,11 doubt 19:14 183:10 240:15 243:24 244:18 245:24 downloadable 52:11 dozen 19:14 179:16 225:2 dozens 20:18 23:12 dr 5:12 6:5 8:4 11:1 92:2 105:4 149:2 195:18 196:12 197:23 220:24 222:25 256:15 257:10 257:15 258:17 263:15 268:1 drafted 38:5 drafting 228:16 238:23 drafts 27:2,6 draw 22:10 23:10 24:21,22 25:4 44:23 45:11,17 64:21 122:7,13,15,17 122:21 123:5 130:7 157:22 218:23 247:6 drawer 19:16 46:19 49:4 53:6 60:3 64:6,7 65:21 97:16,16 97:19 98:1,18,22	101:18 102:16 104:5,13 119:21 122:7,10,13,15 122:17 211:24 214:12,16,24 220:24 221:17 drawer's 213:21 drawers 46:22 53:21 73:4 drawing 19:18 19:20 20:12 21:4 23:15 47:13 64:10 72:22 98:14 135:12 155:12 182:6 220:18 261:5 264:13 267:6 drawn 19:17,25 20:7,21 22:19 25:1,7 45:21,22 86:19 119:22 127:17 128:2,6 132:2 147:2 148:13 176:13 176:18,20,22 177:16,20 178:22 179:3,4 191:25 204:13 204:15 217:18 262:19 drew 20:3 22:23 24:24 25:6 60:13 80:5 229:14 267:16 267:21 dried 122:11	drill 20:20 drive 188:20 drives 162:13 driving 162:10 dropped 65:18 duchin 1:22 3:3 5:12,18 6:1,5,16 8:4 11:1 92:2 105:4 149:2 195:18,24 196:12 197:23 220:24 222:25 256:15 257:10 257:15 258:17 263:15 268:1 271:5 272:2,24 273:2,4,12 due 167:2 219:4 duly 6:2 durham 253:22 dynamical 15:16 e e 5:1,10 50:13 91:19 272:3,3,3 earlier 18:20 31:14 59:8 115:14 129:19 134:24 162:7 198:25 211:21 251:23 253:5 260:19 264:17 early 182:25 earned 119:2 earnestly 259:5 easier 161:10 219:23
---	---	---	---

[easily - employ]

Page 22

easily 114:24 139:19 264:21 264:21	177:18 179:24 268:12	electing 184:23 189:4,25 208:3	162:8 168:4,9,16 168:20 169:1
east 14:23	effectuate 268:16	election 1:16,18 4:9 30:24,25	180:8 182:20 188:4 189:13,20
easy 199:12 264:19	efficient 130:11	120:4,7,12 121:7 122:8 123:13	190:3,16 193:14 202:8 206:24
echoed 121:20	effort 67:12 80:2 82:13,18 83:1,2	156:23 160:15 192:25 193:23	207:3 209:21 210:23 211:15
ecological 153:24	86:21 87:23 102:24 132:23	194:8,8 195:6 219:23,24	211:18 215:21 216:13 221:6,10
economic 90:5 248:11	133:9 204:24 218:15 219:16	222:12	221:15
economical 219:9	219:20	elections 1:15 31:2 114:12	electorate 157:21
edge 130:24	efforts 65:15	117:7 118:20 119:25 121:5,8	elects 170:22
edges 58:21 59:14 62:12	eight 55:22 166:3 172:22 177:22	123:22 151:2,4,5 151:8,15 152:8	element 28:8 131:22 168:25
129:18 130:12 130:20,20,21 265:10	eighth 173:22	152:11 153:19 153:19 157:8	elements 96:3,4 190:22 191:11 234:23
editing 27:5	either 17:5 22:10 30:2 31:22 33:5 41:2 79:10	158:2 169:7 172:5,10,13,16 174:6,13 177:19	eleven 55:18,22 55:23 56:5,12 143:9
edler 1:17	88:18 97:20 139:24 155:8	179:25 185:11 201:14,15 268:14	email 240:11 257:1,3
educational 3:4 14:3,11,15	163:8 169:23 185:25 206:4 224:18 228:21	electoral 13:1 30:18,19,21 34:3 34:4,18 53:2	embodied 215:5 emerged 97:12 192:5
effect 133:10 184:21 185:4,8,9 185:15,20,21,22 186:1,6,9 187:9 187:13 189:2 214:9 246:5 261:14	234:9 242:5,20 248:18 261:13	66:19 114:1,3,4 114:8,13,17,20 115:2,6,15,23 116:3,5,21 117:4 117:5,16,19,22 118:2,9 121:1,3 122:9 123:19 138:4,7 145:19 152:6 153:18 156:9,22 160:11	emphasis 83:6 87:9,14 88:8,10 88:11 98:18
effective 119:4 123:15,17 163:14 167:13 189:18,20	elaine 2:4 270:2 270:16		emphasize 114:19 115:10 115:13 133:5
effectiveness 145:21 146:2 165:3 166:2,19 171:9 176:14	elect 24:16 25:20 112:1,3 115:7 120:14 177:5 178:4 202:17 215:5		emphasized 146:1 182:25
	elected 115:18 118:11 119:1 121:19 170:16 170:22		empirical 236:12 employ 129:14

[employed - evidence]

Page 23

employed 85:1 113:8 227:14 employee 227:7 255:18 employees 11:25 227:8 228:8 240:3,5 employs 76:2 enabled 236:18 236:20 enacted 26:1 31:14,19,23 32:8 32:14 33:1,7,18 45:17 55:25 56:24 59:24 60:14 62:4 63:15 64:24 77:10 79:22 106:3 111:9 139:12 142:16 143:3 144:7,19 144:24 145:3 146:5,17 147:3 149:17 153:6 154:5 155:9 158:17 161:4 165:20,24,24 169:3,4,21 172:21 173:11 173:24 174:18 175:4,8 181:4,24 186:14 187:4,9 187:18,21 188:10 191:18 199:6,24 200:18 201:4,7,18 202:3 213:14 217:12 264:5,7	enacted 2022 184:8 198:22 202:15,21 enactment 97:14 encountered 35:18 120:16 ended 18:11 endorses 83:12 enforced 125:23 126:7 engaged 250:10 250:21 engaging 220:25 engineering 228:3 english 208:9 ensemble 111:16 125:3,9,11 126:9 128:12 129:1 131:14 132:2 133:8,24 134:1,8 134:12,18 135:13,13 136:17 139:9 140:19 141:13 141:17 142:25 146:10,14,15,16 147:12,13,16 148:2,7,7,17 149:12,17 151:6 176:19 178:16 206:10,12 229:15,20 231:2 231:18,19 ensembles 124:25 125:6 127:9,15,20,22 128:10 134:6	136:12 178:21 178:22,24 185:4 231:8 ensure 246:24 ensuring 168:9 entailed 28:13 entered 20:4 entering 210:9 entertain 173:9 entire 86:18 244:9 entirely 61:3 78:25 90:14 93:13 99:20 120:5 123:25 entirety 19:8 82:14 88:15 124:13 entitled 61:24 equal 101:2 146:4 208:19 209:13,19,23 212:23 213:2 equality 58:1 equally 124:20 errata 271:11,13 271:17 erratas 271:15 erratic 61:12 erratically 105:24 eschewed 60:17 especially 15:23 46:16 140:9,16 140:17,24 146:12,13 163:17 168:6 185:10 186:21	208:21 221:20 esquire 271:1 essence 161:24 161:25 essentially 152:24 202:5 establishing 42:9 estimate 9:6 89:7 199:18,20 199:22 251:24 266:1,4 estimates 36:22 36:25 et 202:9,9 271:4 272:1 273:1 ethnic 170:4 262:13 evaluate 24:22 evaluated 24:25 25:6 145:20 172:10 evaluating 21:25 evenings 227:16 evenly 163:24 events 270:9 everybody 197:22 evidence 22:25 32:2,3,6,12 33:4 33:10,11,14 34:4 34:7 119:14 125:9 140:19 168:13,23 182:21 183:1 185:6,7,9,20,21 185:23 186:6,8 186:13,23,25
---	--	---	--

[evidence - explanatory]

Page 24

187:2,4,6,8,12 187:13 188:14 231:18,20 evolved 253:9 exact 37:24 265:23 exactly 64:5 86:22 98:12 120:2 128:9 132:16 133:23 139:11 169:19 198:22 199:6 212:11 226:1 227:25 262:1 examination 5:2 6:3 190:25 192:6 222:5,23 256:14,17 257:13 269:1 examine 23:22 77:11 92:18,21 117:20 examined 174:1 174:4 183:14 190:21 191:10 examining 113:24 117:23 example 20:2,13 35:10 39:13 46:9,11 53:2 54:12 68:21 75:9,14 86:8 90:6 98:4,8,10 98:19 100:18 102:1,7 114:24 116:17 128:8 134:9 153:6 157:15 163:9	168:14 169:4 179:19 192:15 193:22 194:4,5 198:21 208:10 224:22 230:7 232:21,23 235:11 268:5 examples 20:1,9 20:19,20 83:19 91:10 exceeded 234:11 excellent 90:6 95:3 160:18 exception 210:19 exceptions 153:23 excerpts 28:22 29:2 excessively 59:16 214:7,13 exchanged 12:9 excluded 18:23 exclusively 16:14 82:14 excuse 81:1 executive 1:16 20:16 exempt 247:14 247:18 exert 138:4 exhibit 5:12,13 5:15,16,17,17,18 5:19,20 10:24,24 10:25 11:5,19 26:13,14 41:23 42:2 49:19,23 57:22 195:22,23 195:24 196:13	196:16 197:17 197:22,23 259:10 260:12 261:9 exhibits 22:24 22:25 23:4 exist 107:13 108:23 109:14 109:19 existence 240:18 242:4 existing 50:11 70:24 71:4 76:3 exists 83:25 107:9 221:6 249:20 exogenous 151:7 151:12 expect 167:25 189:13,15 190:2 expectations 247:12 expected 99:5 expended 87:24 expense 69:10 69:13 210:8 experience 14:20 45:22 47:10 64:6 65:7 97:15 97:19 98:5 103:11 153:15 219:22 220:23 221:18 243:22 264:12 experienced 243:6 experiences 64:9 262:18	experiment 126:9 experimented 127:21 experiments 127:5 expert 5:19,20 13:12,13,14 17:14 18:11,23 19:20,22 26:5 31:5 77:18 80:9 80:13,20 99:19 150:2,4 196:13 196:16 197:17 214:21 231:5 243:6,23,25 245:4 expertise 18:14 18:18 45:1 170:2 228:25 244:10 249:14 262:19 experts 243:19 244:9 expires 270:17 explain 35:23 126:3 130:15 138:1 189:7 204:3 208:20 215:20 245:8,16 explained 259:2 explanation 169:2 183:9 215:12 explanations 183:18 explanatory 168:1 188:17
--	--	---	---

[explanatory - field]

Page 25

189:1 explicit 70:5,11 98:13 207:17 216:13,18,21 260:20 explicitly 82:25 99:16 216:17 217:1 244:3,19 exposure 267:3 express 32:23 184:12 190:15 expressed 99:22 188:15 261:16 expressing 214:19 expressly 50:10 75:23 184:8,25 186:14 187:19 187:22 188:10 216:17 extension 233:18 extensive 24:2 extensively 53:3 247:25 258:21 258:22 extent 52:13 70:3 73:4 75:11 83:24 100:17 110:15 211:8 214:22 extracted 150:20 extrapolate 86:16 extreme 143:4 extremely 21:21 21:22 eye 148:10	eyebrows 258:7 eyes 71:6 f f 91:19 160:19 259:23 face 151:1 faced 212:4 facing 160:15 fact 37:21 38:15 43:19 47:8 60:6 87:23 88:6 102:8,11,14,15 129:22 140:14 156:1,4 161:23 164:14 169:21 248:15 264:16 266:1 factor 45:15 48:3 162:16,18 162:21,24 163:1 163:3 factors 37:23 44:2 48:3 69:1 134:8 180:6 188:17 190:23 216:14 facts 12:17,20,24 13:8 95:19 217:18 219:1 244:16 249:19 249:22 250:13 250:19,25 factual 45:20 faculty 223:13 240:6 242:9 243:2,23	failed 188:25 fails 35:8 271:19 fair 7:2,19 8:2 30:4 36:15 80:4 166:21 206:25 230:17 254:19 260:23 261:2 265:15 fairer 74:4 fairly 24:2 54:8 200:21 230:2 231:13 260:20 fairness 23:22 24:1,15 25:20 125:10 faith 80:2 82:18 83:1,2 132:23 fall 12:3 48:15 252:17 falls 84:5,5 familiar 46:16 46:25 59:12 196:19,25 241:21 265:2,4 familiarity 239:25 family 230:20 235:3 236:9 237:15 far 18:6 43:25 56:16 74:15 75:6 78:7 129:20 130:24 131:8 160:12 177:19 189:7 249:13,13 fared 117:7 175:13	fascinating 128:22 fashion 176:13 176:18,21 177:16 faster 130:11 fat 142:7 favoring 72:8,22 favorite 170:16 feature 131:2 featured 179:15 179:18,21,23 180:8 features 77:13 135:2,5 181:3 federal 18:3 43:10 57:12,25 232:5 242:24 244:3,11 262:8 federally 237:9 federation 192:19 feedback 258:4 feel 7:22 164:1 184:24 186:5 187:25 188:5 216:11,18 243:10 feels 10:4 fellow 15:7 241:14 felt 197:15 219:1 fewer 131:8 132:8 200:12 255:4 field 120:5 129:5 134:4,13 135:1
---	---	---	--

[fifield - formal]

Page 26

fifield 256:6,20	94:6,21 97:3	175:10,18,25	focuses 84:11
fifteen 213:25	103:24 110:17	177:10 184:5	focusing 102:14
fifteenth 261:18	131:7 132:24	191:9 196:24	135:17
fifth 3:7 205:24	133:17 139:19	201:13 202:1	fold 48:11
fifty 251:24	139:22 140:18	203:19 205:17	folder 11:14
figure 35:20	163:13 168:14	210:20 216:21	folks 214:19
36:4,10,17 37:1	183:8 184:7	223:4 227:4	224:20 225:8
37:3,6,6,7,13,15	185:7 186:25	229:18,19	243:12
38:7,15,25 39:8	188:25 191:18	253:18 258:23	follow 41:9 44:9
39:13 40:3	207:1 217:6	258:24 259:1,17	49:4 72:1 85:18
41:13 76:17	218:16 226:19	261:11 262:5	85:20 160:9
77:8,21 82:1	229:11 231:17	263:22	166:22 189:17
89:17 105:12	231:19,21	fiscal 233:16	226:13 250:2
108:6 128:8	249:17,24 253:1	fit 117:12	followed 246:21
132:16 136:25	266:8	five 15:20 23:24	246:25
139:6 142:15	finding 53:18	50:25 55:22	following 40:25
143:6 147:25	120:22 172:8	56:11 82:2	190:2 250:6
151:21,23	findings 186:21	152:13 154:23	254:14
156:17,18 171:3	186:23,24	155:16 247:25	follows 6:2 201:8
172:20 173:7	fine 45:25 93:8	253:20 256:4	259:18
176:14 177:17	101:9 104:24	264:11	foot 239:4
179:23 180:9	130:1 180:1	fix 264:13	footnote 60:24
191:4,14 192:4	finish 102:3	fixed 218:19	154:16,18
193:23 194:12	finished 14:20	flag 28:23	155:18 158:1
195:7 198:20	firm 6:6 10:19	flip 154:10 256:5	224:7
201:13,20	251:12	floor 3:7,21	force 253:6
figures 111:14	firms 251:8,9	florida 72:25	foregoing 270:5
128:5,7,9,10	first 6:2,14 8:18	focus 15:22	273:5
133:17 195:3	9:21,23,25 35:3	40:20 87:9,14	forest 108:13
file 66:21 219:17	40:23 41:3,9	88:24 139:1	forget 230:15
files 66:23 67:1,2	42:4,16 43:2,6,7	143:11 144:2	forgive 215:15
financed 249:12	43:13 44:7,15	178:18 214:20	form 7:9 17:5,6
financial 231:25	48:1 51:13	focused 16:14	28:16 34:22
246:3	53:24 55:5	24:15 68:9	82:8 148:2
find 29:11 32:10	69:19 71:15	137:8 144:5	225:15 231:13
32:12 41:10	102:19 125:22	147:7 148:7	242:4,9 243:15
49:12 69:21,24	128:23 136:11	167:8	formal 119:13
75:25 82:24	147:11 163:7		253:12

[formally - generally]

Page 27

formally 14:6	175:12 176:5	188:12,23	g
forman 4:10	235:2 253:8	223:16 227:7	g 11:23 160:19
formed 254:25	264:9,11	251:14 255:18	gathered 86:12
forming 195:9	fourteenth	262:10	gauged 121:4
forms 180:4	261:18	fullest 52:13	general 22:5
183:23 237:3,5	fraction 252:3	fully 17:16	24:13 27:22
242:21	fraga 160:19	188:25 208:20	44:11,22 45:11
formula 60:22	frames 52:4	221:3 224:12,13	45:16 47:9,12,17
formulating	framework 74:3	227:11 245:1,22	47:19 52:19
75:1	98:16 100:17	function 145:17	59:22 60:12
forthcoming	231:2	176:2 178:15	67:10 68:25
38:20 251:15	frameworks	188:13 223:17	69:5 71:7,25
forward 215:9	24:2	functional 61:4	72:7,9 73:15
found 21:22 95:1	francisco 253:23	functions 73:10	88:5 99:9
127:22 131:13	frankly 223:2	226:15	101:18 102:16
185:5 186:13,13	free 52:11	fund 3:4 10:13	103:25 104:5,13
190:22 229:20	freely 52:9,11	232:19	110:19 113:6
foundation	frequency 154:4	fundamental	116:11 120:8
226:2,5 232:2,4	frequent 16:24	120:21	160:15 172:9,15
232:12 253:24	frequently 20:23	funded 232:24	182:24 190:5
foundations	51:24 61:12	235:7 236:4,9	208:17 209:14
253:24	64:11 79:6	237:9 244:11	210:6,14 211:7
four 20:3,25	82:25 91:7 94:6	248:19 253:23	212:4 214:11,17
21:1,10 47:24	114:18 122:1	funding 235:18	216:7,10,22
54:22 55:21	123:12 132:25	235:21 238:17	242:17,19
56:10 77:5	150:10 157:19	248:4,6,9 249:15	261:12 266:25
79:23 81:14,20	166:18 175:9	fundraising	generality 75:17
81:23 82:2	friday 8:21	231:24	97:24 101:5
88:25 118:20,22	friends 253:1,8	funds 233:15	128:24
119:25 123:22	front 90:22 93:7	further 32:16	generalize
137:9 147:20	94:13 141:18	114:6 158:10	206:21
150:19 152:3,4,8	146:24 158:19	196:10 221:22	generally 21:21
152:10,11,13	158:22 199:12	269:18 270:7	30:1 52:7 68:18
153:7 154:7,19	202:24 240:15	fuse 129:8 130:7	71:7,16,17,19
154:25 155:13	froze 237:22,24	future 32:20,22	72:20 74:20
158:2 162:3,4	full 15:5 100:16		83:20,22 88:12
165:4 166:3,4	131:7 142:8		103:19 111:23
169:7 174:13	172:7 187:24		151:7 186:22

222:14 259:4 generate 37:12 38:15 51:11 143:10 159:11 172:22 174:22 generated 38:7 149:11 154:15 generates 125:13 159:2 173:11,24 174:18 generation 133:25 206:10 206:12 genesis 252:19 geographic 51:25 178:19 geographical 52:5 geographically 137:16 geography 46:17 47:1 51:25 59:18 78:11 84:7 164:2 177:7,8 178:5,8 178:9,11,12,22 178:23,24 179:2 218:18 geometric 15:13 geometry 15:17 224:17 235:15 252:21 geopandas 52:1 52:2,4 geounits 191:21 gerrychain 224:2,4,8 230:8	gerrymandering 25:23 125:4,7 224:17 252:22 getting 83:5 137:1 159:15 192:2 193:11 236:19 238:2 241:9 258:12 260:1 gingle 150:3 gingles 20:4 21:2 113:11,13,15,17 118:3,4 120:19 150:5 261:17 gis 52:1 gist 188:5 give 6:24 20:9 23:2 28:11 38:18,23 39:4 47:2 67:19,20,23 67:25 68:3 75:9 84:21 85:15 91:22 119:11,13 121:15,22 124:16 126:12 128:21 158:6 168:22 257:10 given 42:15 63:7 69:20 97:3 207:21 211:4,16 249:19 250:11 250:13 259:20 273:9 gives 93:20 232:5 glad 167:18 gladly 35:25	glenn 118:23 glibly 123:4 glitchy 238:3 go 7:11 8:1 10:23 28:5 32:17 40:12 43:25 51:3 67:5 67:6 77:20 90:2 91:3 104:23 105:8,12 108:24 112:17 116:16 126:15 139:6,20 144:17 147:7 148:24 151:23 155:18 158:12 159:10,19 166:9 170:13 172:4,19 179:17 180:22 181:11 195:13 195:15,15 203:23 226:4,11 257:9 goal 190:14 goes 44:25 90:9 120:3 131:8 170:15 189:7 212:21 226:3 228:18 238:20 going 11:22 31:18 41:12 50:21 58:25 59:20,21 63:4 76:4,16 86:21 88:14 108:16,17 116:25 148:20 154:10 184:2 195:12 221:8 222:20,22	243:14 256:8 262:2 good 6:5 43:18 52:22 73:21,25 74:19,25 80:2 82:18 83:1,2 84:3 116:1 132:23 140:24 156:14 167:18 188:19 190:9 203:25 204:6,8 205:3 210:12 220:3 222:10 267:4,8 google 110:9 gore 3:13 5:3,7 6:4,6 11:3 26:16 42:1 49:21 50:19,25 51:3,4 92:1 103:10 104:22 105:2,3 148:19,24 149:1 185:24 186:10 195:11,15,17 196:18 197:20 221:22 249:9 256:10 257:16 258:17,23 263:24 268:2,24 269:2,18 gore's 261:4 263:15 264:24 265:17 266:23 gorgeous 62:17 govern 101:2 governance 267:4
--	--	---	--

[government - happen]

Page 29

government 73:22,25 74:19 74:25 204:6,8 205:3 232:5 242:24 244:3,12	great 26:12 28:16 31:18 51:1 128:3 236:12 greater 57:14,20 58:12,15 63:7 202:17 greatly 83:7 green 91:23 143:1 greenville 4:5 270:12 grew 224:17 ground 184:4 group 15:17 21:8 75:12 102:1 115:7 116:4 120:14 129:5 170:4 224:16,18 240:25 252:22 252:23 groups 74:6,12 114:10 118:10 121:17 153:23 grove 2:4 270:2 270:16 guarantee 122:9 guaranteed 123:5 gubernatorial 20:16 guess 26:3 157:6 181:22 204:19 224:8 231:24 252:15 253:12 guesswork 267:13,20	guggenheim 254:10 guidance 128:21 189:11 guideline 189:6 guidelines 5:15 5:16 9:16 30:10 40:15,19,21,25 41:3,10,11,15,17 41:20,23 42:4,11 42:13 43:9,21,22 44:6,19 45:3,4 45:10,15 48:2,5 48:8,11,15,17,19 48:25 49:3,9,10 49:11,12,14,16 49:19,24 50:2 57:9,11 60:17,25 61:16 63:5 67:11,15,17,19 68:7,21,24 69:2 69:7,11,16,18,22 70:13,15,20 72:18 75:23 79:11,15 99:15 99:16 100:10 183:16,23 184:9 184:13 185:14 186:14 187:20 187:21,25 188:1 188:6,9 189:9,24 190:2,12,15 203:12 204:12 204:14 206:18 206:20,23 207:1 207:2,4,8,13,14 207:17 208:1,5 208:17,24	209:10,11,12,24 210:6,14,14,17 210:18 211:6 212:3,14,18,23 213:1 214:6 220:16,22 258:20 259:9 260:10,24 261:8 261:21,23 262:3 269:4,8,15,17 guise 71:22 h h 1:14 5:10 6:17 272:3 half 56:11 126:5 142:7 148:11 162:1 173:22 174:2 175:6 hall 2:1 225:17 225:19 239:1,4 247:22,24 hand 18:19,19 56:16 126:8 127:3 206:1 212:6,7 264:18 270:10 handed 13:21 82:20 handful 223:3 handle 52:3 66:3 handled 48:17 hang 107:15 happen 141:15 158:15 163:5 246:19 247:13 248:4
--	---	--	--

[happened - hook]

Page 30

<p>happened 16:22 20:1 254:13</p> <p>happening 77:25</p> <p>happens 64:12 117:24 159:6</p> <p>happily 185:3</p> <p>happy 17:16 43:3 50:23 101:6 249:16</p> <p>hard 29:22 72:7 86:22 95:4 97:1 160:14 161:11 206:19 208:21 214:18 219:21</p> <p>harpootlian 57:4 57:8 58:13 62:9 65:3 94:16,22,23 95:2,8,11,16,22 96:13,17 97:4,6 97:12 142:17 143:2 159:2,11 159:21 160:22 161:2,14,22 164:25 167:11 172:25 178:2 200:8,17 201:3,8 201:10,17 202:3 202:13 263:25 264:10</p> <p>harris 118:24 152:14</p> <p>harrison 64:25 118:23</p> <p>harvard 14:5 230:10</p> <p>haul 121:18</p> <p>head 17:1 90:2 91:2,12 163:4</p>	<p>headed 136:8</p> <p>header 68:22</p> <p>heading 49:18 67:18 68:19 73:24 76:6,9 93:2 105:23 109:7 259:16</p> <p>headings 48:20 48:23 69:2,6</p> <p>headshake 7:1</p> <p>healed 191:22</p> <p>healing 79:5,19 79:20 191:20 192:7,11,24</p> <p>hear 92:5 121:20</p> <p>heard 19:11 56:21 74:9 83:25 169:14 251:10</p> <p>hearing 28:10 80:5,12,22 81:22 82:22 86:16 87:9 88:20 89:5 226:22</p> <p>hearings 204:17 265:21 266:15</p> <p>heart 25:17</p> <p>held 14:24 235:25</p> <p>help 66:9 173:6 186:17 218:7 229:11 239:5</p> <p>helped 228:19</p> <p>helpful 32:4 68:2 101:7 117:17 131:2 185:5 193:13 211:20</p>	<p>helping 246:14</p> <p>helps 74:3 126:6</p> <p>henry 271:4 272:1 273:1</p> <p>hereto 273:7</p> <p>hereunto 270:10</p> <p>high 14:4 67:13 68:10,16 123:5,9 127:10 128:23 136:11 143:2,5 147:3 156:7 168:5,7 214:6,13</p> <p>higher 129:16 130:21 132:6 142:20 156:3 161:6,7,23 162:1 167:23 175:15 175:18,22,25 176:5,6 180:24 209:5 210:1 264:20</p> <p>highest 55:6,6 137:2,7,8,10,18 137:19,22 138:10,14 139:1 139:13 141:16 142:3,6,9,12 143:19,25 144:4 144:8,12,18,19 144:23,24 146:16,18,23 148:8 160:21,25 161:3 165:16 166:15 167:8,13 208:18 209:15</p> <p>highlight 77:12</p> <p>highlighted 82:3</p>	<p>highlighting 89:18</p> <p>highly 94:16 95:11,13</p> <p>hinges 85:16</p> <p>histogram 139:8 140:12,13 141:25 145:2 148:1 156:17 171:5,5,11 172:20 173:11 174:16 175:2,10 175:11,14</p> <p>histograms 174:11</p> <p>historical 18:21 64:16 163:18</p> <p>historically 163:14</p> <p>history 117:5,16 134:11 152:6 153:19 156:23 168:4 169:1 193:5</p> <p>hitting 168:19</p> <p>hold 32:25 33:3 33:16,20 53:21 178:21 235:9</p> <p>holistic 61:14 188:22 193:21 231:17</p> <p>home 239:8</p> <p>honest 102:23</p> <p>honestly 202:24 245:22</p> <p>hook 61:13 107:10,13,16,17 107:19,23 108:1</p>
--	---	---	--

[hope - include]

Page 31

hope 37:10 83:22 91:20 106:2 171:7 188:15 223:23 231:22 236:18 hopefully 223:3 hoping 173:5,8 hospitals 234:8 host 103:19 265:6 hour 9:6 29:8 50:22 148:21 195:12 hourly 251:21 255:19 hours 8:23 27:1 29:23 251:18,21 251:24,25 252:2 252:4 255:4 house 1:12,13,14 4:2 9:15 10:7 23:20 29:20 30:10 40:16 41:2,6,15,16,19 42:3 43:8,21,22 44:5 45:3,3,6 48:5,8,11,14,24 49:9,16 60:17 63:5 67:18 68:21 69:16 70:13,14,19 79:10 81:2 136:2 183:17 203:15 206:20 207:16 220:15 220:21 223:2 258:18 260:10 262:3 266:15	howard 1:15 huge 84:5 94:9 huh 70:22 106:25 human 127:3 177:6,8 178:5,8 178:9,11,22,23 179:2,3 hundreds 84:8 hypothetical 98:17 209:4	identifies 30:6 192:16,18 identify 29:22 49:3 79:23 80:22 81:8,10 97:10 214:18 identifying 92:8 identities 25:3 identity 142:12 ii 42:14,20 118:5 118:7 120:23 261:22,23 262:3 iii 42:14,17,19 42:20,21 49:15 50:7 259:11,13 illegal 102:10 103:4 illogical 109:21 illusive 123:6 illustrate 62:18 illustrates 113:16 illustrations 62:17,17 image 38:21 images 94:21 imagine 45:21 112:14 122:12 122:14,16 132:3 157:16 267:14 immediately 179:22 immutable 163:12 impasse 25:22 25:24 imperative 190:14	imperfect 162:8 implementations 230:2 implemented 128:12 implication 260:9 implications 117:18 implicit 49:9 69:24 216:12,20 implicitly 216:25 221:7 implied 79:18 imply 206:11 importance 90:5 131:5 important 7:14 25:14,17,21 64:20 134:6,10 142:4 145:16,18 151:6 190:16 264:22 impossible 46:20 46:23 impression 38:19,23 39:5 52:25 96:10,14 158:7 216:22 258:13 impressions 195:10 inadvertently 30:18 incidentally 81:25 91:6 include 38:11 59:13 62:23
	i		
	i.e. 154:20 idea 35:6 84:9 84:13 90:9 121:3,21 132:22 133:13 139:3 212:15 251:5 ideas 230:4 231:9 identical 144:2 155:8,11 identifiable 63:8 identification 192:20 identified 42:11 43:2 79:2 81:14 81:20,21,23 82:4 89:5 91:5 117:6 118:20,22 132:11 142:20 149:10,24 150:13 152:9,9 154:11 164:4 174:14 195:7 203:11 220:16 227:1		

[include - interest]

Page 32

82:23 203:8,9 211:15 235:21 241:25 included 25:8 89:21 90:4 93:20,25 94:1 137:15 166:23 183:15,16,22 220:6,7 236:16 includes 12:25 165:4 181:1 including 30:8 79:7 125:9 167:3 198:20 258:1 inclusion 68:17 income 226:14 255:20 incorporated 258:6 265:18 incorrect 228:7 increase 126:6 190:6 increased 189:11 189:13,21,22 190:3 incumbencies 136:6 incumbency 49:8 66:12 69:25 71:15,20 72:2,4,5,22 74:10 135:25 136:2,4 207:19 incumbent 66:13 66:16 76:12,18 76:21 107:24 108:1,3,5	incumbents 72:8 72:22 76:10 independent 2:5 150:7 independently 95:25 indicates 41:8 231:25 239:24 266:13 indicating 22:12 37:22 indication 119:20 121:22 140:24 indirect 225:22 individual 64:15 82:17 253:15 255:12 individuals 87:15 88:19 228:12 246:13 indulge 173:10 ineffective 185:10 inevitably 221:3 inference 153:24 influence 70:2 156:9 informal 68:23 85:7 96:8,10 252:23 253:4 informally 36:6 78:5 111:12 information 28:12 66:17 242:9 266:21 initial 31:9,12 34:1	initially 234:9,10 234:21 innovation 129:4 input 84:10,10 204:16 inputs 176:2 inquiry 118:7 insist 188:23 instance 60:8 75:11 85:8 86:3 98:6 101:23 113:4,7 124:18 191:14 instances 60:5 159:15,18 172:1 205:5,7 instantaneous 265:16 institute 15:2 233:1 instruct 88:24 instructed 7:10 98:6,8 instructing 122:17 instructions 98:1 122:19 insubstantial 67:1 integrity 130:18 intend 33:11 44:3 intended 44:9 52:4 118:6 119:13 248:11 intending 115:24	intense 15:21 intensity 36:1 intensive 83:8 intent 103:21 184:21 185:2,4,6 185:14,19,20,22 186:1,6,8 187:4 187:7,13 208:5 intention 99:4 intentionally 31:23 32:8,15 33:1 250:18 interact 183:25 233:9 interest 15:24,25 20:10 30:13 39:12 43:15 47:25 48:1,16 49:1 62:24 63:9 70:21,25 71:5,8 71:11,23 72:15 73:17,24 74:12 74:14 75:7,13 79:24 81:9,11,14 81:21,24 82:22 83:22 84:2 85:7 85:19 87:8,14 88:21 89:4 90:7 91:5,9 92:9 94:4 95:16 98:19,23 132:11,13,18 188:2 217:8 226:12 227:12 239:25 240:4,10 240:16,22 242:3 242:21 244:13 244:22 245:11 248:17 249:3,7
--	--	---	---

[interest - kind]

Page 33

249:20 250:2,5 250:10,13,21 252:19,25 257:9 269:12 interested 270:9 interesting 53:14 65:23 interests 18:17 205:7 252:7 268:13 interim 1:15 intermixed 227:18 internet 238:2 interpolated 131:6 interpretation 158:8 213:10 interpreted 140:20 152:1 interrupt 141:12 intimately 46:16 introduce 10:24 introduced 5:17 13:7 95:21 96:9 96:14 129:5 introduction 96:2 investigate 114:6 investigating 112:21,22 investigation 111:11 investigator 224:19 232:15 233:23	invite 103:2,3 invoices 29:18 29:20 226:16,25 228:2 invoked 209:8 involve 33:22,23 34:10,16,20,25 112:11 181:8 250:4 involved 60:8 66:1 78:14 100:4 125:7 227:21 involvement 116:6 involves 53:2 96:24 111:25 119:25 211:22 involving 79:2 irrespective 65:18 issue 21:8 25:17 53:3 181:6 248:11 issued 11:11 40:15 183:16 issues 25:14,15 25:19 34:20 138:18 223:24 248:16 253:8 itemize 179:17 itemized 48:14 iv 42:14,20 43:8 ix 42:8,9 44:5 207:17,22 260:14	j j 1:17 12:8 jane 4:10 jasper 89:20,21 90:1,6,13 99:7 jcsick 3:9 jenner 251:12 jmc 1:8 jmgore 3:15 joanne 1:17 job 247:3,4 joe 152:14 john 1:16 3:6,13 6:6 8:25 joined 30:24 253:6 joint 230:10,14 jointly 258:10 jones 3:13 6:6 jonesday.com 3:15 jordan 1:14 journal 16:18,19 17:3 jtrinkley 4:13 judge 19:12 judged 60:21 judgment 184:14 187:22 203:3 246:8 250:4 judiciary 1:11 1:13 july 1:23 266:14 270:11 271:3 justification 127:8 207:2,5 215:11 216:4,17	217:2 justifications 92:15,19 215:4 215:20 justified 180:6 207:7 justify 206:4 214:2,7,13 216:3 216:13 justifying 58:6 215:23 justin 230:11,12 253:5
			k
			k 230:21 kamala 152:14 keep 133:9 157:2 205:13 206:3 213:18,21 214:1 219:16 222:20 222:22 226:14 keeping 76:10 99:6 100:4 106:10 177:6 178:5 179:1 219:22 220:1 225:23 kept 90:9 94:3 104:6,14 130:25 key 79:5 139:16 171:9 189:22 kind 20:20 35:25 60:11,13 67:16 77:16 83:13 86:22 93:14 102:5 120:3,21 126:5 127:8

[kind - leave]

Page 34

139:8 141:9	158:15 163:5	240:17 241:17	100:20,22 102:5
142:5 148:2	164:8 172:11,14	241:23 242:1,5,8	102:22 103:17
182:16 185:9	173:14,20 183:7	242:8,11,12,22	103:18,20,22
192:3 193:8,14	190:17 200:17	247:1,5,8 248:18	104:18,21
199:8 206:13	200:20 201:2,10	249:2 251:3,19	121:17 214:5
227:9 230:3	203:8 204:21	252:20 253:10	216:2 251:9,11
231:1 253:3,6	210:13 212:17	253:11,16,17	251:12 262:8
kinds 33:15 46:5	214:22 216:2	254:24 255:5,16	laws 42:22
108:18 110:8	219:6,11,12,15	labeled 82:9	204:10 262:14
126:16,24	222:7,11,25	labor 227:5	lawyer 74:18
168:21 182:21	228:21 239:9,12	labyrinth 234:2	255:24
216:14 263:12	245:18,19	lack 60:17	lawyers 251:10
268:20	247:13,15 248:4	laden 3:8 271:2	layer 46:8,9,11
knapp 1:15	248:6 249:14,16	ladson 106:1	46:14,23 221:13
know 7:24 9:18	249:22 251:5	land 17:8 19:18	layperson
10:6 16:23 19:1	252:13 255:8	20:12	133:20
24:6 25:3,5,22	266:16 269:8	language 42:7,7	ldf 10:15,16
25:24 27:6	knowledge 47:14	51:23 58:9	226:25 251:9
29:14 37:17	47:18 59:3 60:2	102:1 117:1	257:1,3,22 258:8
38:25 39:7 40:2	60:15 65:7	161:20 170:4	258:11,14
40:7,10 45:16,23	101:17 123:18	212:9	lead 183:25
46:22 47:11	172:16 183:24	large 23:21 54:6	leads 183:9
52:19,22 65:13	222:14 229:5	78:6,11 86:18	204:17
65:14,15 69:3	257:5	189:1 255:5	league 57:8
72:17 84:10	known 46:19	270:4	58:14 65:3
93:15,17 94:11	214:8	larger 58:6	143:7 164:24
96:23 98:9	knows 242:6	largest 141:19	263:25 264:10
104:18,21	kopecky 228:4	231:25 238:16	leah 3:5 8:25
106:14 107:1,4	238:21	late 8:20 96:15	10:2 91:20
108:3,14 109:2	kruskal's 130:16	launched 253:19	271:1
110:10,23	l	laura 233:9,11	leaning 268:4
112:18 119:12	l 2:4 270:2,16	law 1:15 6:6	learn 200:1
119:21 120:1	lab 51:16 223:6	10:19 43:2,10,17	250:1
124:13 126:13	223:10,11,11	43:19,24 44:1	learning 64:9
135:9 141:14,15	224:2 226:8,17	57:13,25 73:9,13	leave 162:25
141:22 142:5,23	229:3 232:7,10	73:14,18 74:13	186:7 240:21
145:19 149:23	232:15,23	74:14,17,23 75:5	241:1,6,7,10,12
154:14 156:12		75:14,14 97:22	241:13,15,18

[leave - local]

Page 35

251:17 254:3,4,9 254:17,18,20 255:3 269:13 leaves 157:20 led 155:23 156:6 158:5,21 205:16 206:7 left 64:2 145:8 145:12 148:11 legal 3:4 10:13 26:4 31:25 33:12,13 53:16 100:13,17 101:24 104:5,14 115:14,25 190:10 209:2 255:11 262:17 271:23 legally 103:16 104:9,10 legislative 5:15 14:14 17:11 41:24 42:10 44:13 92:20,22 96:12 98:10 183:21 legislators 76:12 266:24 267:16 legislature 97:14 100:20,23 177:4 178:1 209:25 214:17 265:19 legislature's 184:8,13 187:19 legislatures 74:8 legitimate 74:11 75:13 133:3 215:20 263:11	length 132:20 lessened 79:21 letter 11:23 12:8 level 114:16 116:18 117:14 117:20,23 120:21 127:1 128:21,24 129:24 168:19 177:6 178:4 179:1 190:18 209:2 214:6 221:4,5 levels 23:19,23 114:22 163:19 lewis 91:4 192:16 liberties 3:18,19 library 224:2,5,9 life 15:7 223:9 light 91:23 lights 225:23 likelihood 114:12 limiting 135:3,5 linda 1:17 line 5:1,11 44:24 46:19,22 55:2 64:15 106:15,16 110:12 119:12 119:16 120:17 133:2 142:15 143:1 145:2,3,8 159:16 166:5 182:6 202:6 205:24,25 206:1 216:20 219:8 237:21,24 238:1	238:4 272:4,7,10 272:13,16,19 lines 45:12,17 54:9 105:15,16 108:7,8 118:12 120:18 142:19 143:7 191:13 217:22,24,25 218:2 219:8 222:9 247:6 261:11 list 17:15 30:18 47:24 150:19 172:10 230:23 listed 16:7 51:13 64:2 66:13 68:6 69:10 70:1 134:17 152:19 155:2 172:5 237:7,16,19 lists 153:7 235:1 237:2 literally 206:18 208:2 literature 81:6 83:12,24 84:6,7 84:18 120:25,25 121:9,14,25 137:23 litigation 19:18 20:9,13 22:15 53:1 60:7 66:1 77:8 99:18 121:24 226:10 226:14 227:15 246:23 251:8 little 7:22 20:24 28:11 35:12	50:21 67:1 71:2 91:24 115:20 117:1 122:6 125:17 149:22 150:18 170:1 173:6 195:12 205:8 206:19 238:3 liu 150:2 liu's 150:5 live 143:22 163:6 163:9 178:10,10 178:14 lives 178:19 239:3 living 110:21 liz 228:4,6,12,19 228:21 229:7 238:19,21 239:5 239:6 246:20 liz's 229:4 llc 4:3 226:9,17 227:5,17 240:17 240:18 241:17 241:19 242:5,11 242:13,22 247:1 247:6 248:18 249:2 254:24 255:5,8,10,13,13 255:15,16 256:1 llc's 251:3 llp 4:10 load 15:13 236:17 local 26:11 41:18 97:22 218:10 219:19
--	--	---	--

[localize - map]

Page 36

localize 191:16	67:15 87:11	145:8 146:4,17	making 82:11
localized 167:1	137:19 163:12	146:18 161:2,6,8	115:14 123:13
locally 49:25	188:16 193:3	165:12,19,23	155:6 188:19
located 106:7	looking 11:5	166:12,20	221:1 248:17
225:15 249:12	55:5 70:12	167:24 199:23	249:21 250:20
location 2:1	82:19 84:15	199:25 201:9	268:19
142:6	85:9 87:8 158:2	207:18 209:6,8	manageable
locations 178:11	168:22 179:23	260:5	251:23
logic 137:25	191:14 196:23	lowest 140:14,23	management
138:1,17	201:20 233:14	luke 1:10 2:3	228:5
long 8:22 9:5	264:3	3:12 6:8	manner 46:4
10:5 31:10	looks 18:20 56:6	lunch 132:20	61:14 184:22
265:12	56:24 62:4	lww 144:11,17	189:3 208:2,7
look 10:9 16:6	64:24 78:4	145:7 165:9,15	246:2
24:16 33:25	123:15,16	165:23 167:11	map 19:16,20
34:1,2 35:2,3	141:13,19,25	172:25 178:1	24:21 25:1,6,25
38:25 39:8,18	143:25 144:14	lwwsc 57:5	31:14 34:6
40:3,6 55:2	144:16 148:6,10	m	35:25 49:4 53:6
57:10,16 67:25	160:24 165:9	m 3:13 6:17	53:21 54:14
81:25 94:20	171:4 172:4,20	230:21	60:3 64:6,7
117:7,15 119:1	173:10 191:14	madison 253:21	65:21 73:4
136:1,3,6 140:19	lose 268:4	main 4:4,11 13:7	77:10,10 78:24
146:20,22	lost 92:4	230:25	97:16,16,19 98:1
151:17,18	lot 123:14	maintain 221:8	98:18,20,21,22
158:20 159:1	241:13	maintaining	101:17 102:16
164:24 165:8	louisiana 3:14	93:10,24 94:24	104:5,13 113:15
166:2 182:19,20	love 85:15 121:5	264:22	119:21,22 122:7
192:25 193:4	low 89:10 109:24	maintains	122:10,13,15,17
194:5,10,11,12	137:22 139:4	219:13	149:12 178:1
214:3 215:9	140:9,11,16,25	major 119:2	200:9,17 201:3,4
252:16 254:15	145:25 146:11	152:21	201:10 202:13
259:8,13 260:10	146:12,13	majority 21:5,12	202:14 211:24
261:7 262:2,20	163:16 176:14	22:10,14 56:7	213:20 214:12
263:21 268:12	177:17 266:1	114:14 122:3	214:16,24
looked 11:15,21	lowcountry 93:1	148:6 255:5	220:24 221:17
23:25 24:1 30:9	94:22	makers 131:12	263:1 264:5,7,12
39:4 46:10	lower 43:22 55:9	221:4	264:19 267:5
55:14 63:22	55:13 144:18		

mapmaker 263:8	markedly 202:8	256:12,16,19	128:7 133:21,23
mapping 84:6,9 84:14 224:5	markov 129:2,3 129:14 224:4 230:20,21	257:6	134:1,11,17,21
maps 13:6 19:17 19:25 20:3,8,14 20:18,21 21:1,4 21:17,20,23,25 22:6,19,22 23:5 23:10,13 24:24 45:21,22 51:11 51:13 64:10 66:2 80:15,16 83:18 95:20 111:16 122:7 127:3,6 131:8,11 131:15 136:12 148:17 176:13 176:17 177:16 177:20 179:3,4,8 179:14 180:16 261:5 262:19,22 263:17 264:1,8 267:10,16,21	231:12 235:3,16 236:10 237:15 marshal 183:1 mary 90:4 mass 148:11 massachusetts 2:2 8:7 248:10 255:9,16 master 19:12,13 master's 14:10 match 171:9 materials 8:16 11:14,24 12:6 30:7,14,17 90:22 107:4 108:19 110:9 math 14:10 130:13 173:6 235:14 248:7 mathematical 15:1 60:4,18,22 61:21 230:3 252:8 mathematician 173:6 186:20 mathematics 14:7,10 15:6,12 230:18 252:15 mathias 4:4 5:5 91:24 222:18,22 222:24,25 237:23 245:6,15 245:23 248:22 250:8,17 251:2	matriculated 14:8 matter 10:8 12:10,24 13:5 29:16,25 43:19 45:20 53:13,16 60:11 63:8 71:8 71:25 72:7,10,10 73:21 80:17 117:3 120:8 172:15 248:14 matters 10:11 226:10 244:12 maximization 211:13 maximize 211:7 211:12 mayor 94:1 mccall 1:17 mcmaster 271:4 272:1 273:1 mean 12:21 16:18 19:5 22:24 25:19,25 27:14 43:20 45:19 46:14 51:18 55:15 59:11 75:10 78:1 79:20 86:11 88:14 94:19 96:7,21 102:16 107:24 110:2 111:21 113:3,14,25 115:16 119:11 123:3,20 124:17	136:9 138:10,11 152:13 157:10 158:6 160:12 169:15,19 179:3 179:18 183:12 183:14,19 191:13 203:8 204:5 206:11 220:11 229:1,23 254:15 259:25 meaning 211:12 meaningful 120:22 168:16 means 55:24 112:22 116:10 129:15 130:23 132:6 134:3,21 136:5 151:10 152:21 159:25 169:10 170:5 178:8,9,10 189:16,23 204:4 206:17 208:6,8 223:11 255:14 258:3 268:16,18 meant 25:25 34:23,24 85:16 96:22 140:17 168:25 178:7 186:17 206:10 212:19 216:7 236:17 256:1 259:4 measurable 74:5 133:11,16 264:22

measurably 202:16	243:4,17	metric 52:24	107:25 164:13
measure 25:19	mentioned 16:12	98:7 127:7	164:15 177:12
53:5,7 59:23	19:24 22:18	129:17,18	188:20 259:17
186:7 265:10	23:5,12 30:19	224:17 252:21	minds 46:25
measured 180:7	49:7 66:19	metrics 51:10,11	47:4,6,8
measures 58:19	75:25 93:16	51:18 59:5,23	mine 216:1
60:4,6 61:21	95:18 100:8	60:9 61:9,24	minimal 264:13
62:14 264:25	125:8 132:25	62:4,6,14,23	minimizing
265:8,13	220:20 223:8	95:1,4,5 96:19	50:13
mechanical	224:15 226:17	96:24 97:3	minimum
51:19	226:19 227:6	179:19 180:8,23	113:23 130:13
medford 2:2	229:17 235:24	181:20,23 182:3	minorities
meeting 242:20	238:19 239:23	182:7,14,18	184:23 189:4,25
267:22	252:7 253:5	188:21 201:11	208:3
meetings 242:14	264:18	203:10	minority 21:5
266:13	mentions 107:10	mggg 223:5,10	24:16 25:20
member 47:16	130:6 197:5,6	224:1,11,20,21	44:18 102:1
47:19 253:7	258:15	224:23 225:4,5,7	115:7 116:3
255:15	merge 66:22	225:14,18 228:7	122:22 123:2
members 1:18	merit 207:14	228:10,23	149:22 153:23
44:11 101:25	merited 68:17	229:21 231:23	161:14 184:15
263:18 266:25	meriting 206:24	232:1,11,19	184:22 187:5,10
memory 11:20	merits 78:8	238:17,22,24	188:4 189:3
35:19 75:18	met 47:18 215:8	239:1,17,20	190:15 202:17
145:5 184:18	223:1 242:16,16	240:17 241:16	205:13 206:5,24
234:21	method 80:8	241:24 242:6	207:3,5,6,15,20
men 192:19	81:5,8 84:19,20	248:19 249:12	207:21,25
mention 24:19	84:22 85:1,13,17	252:20 253:4,18	208:18 209:5,6,8
49:13 70:20	125:3,11 128:12	254:1,2	209:16,21 210:1
89:19 90:16,21	129:1 131:1	michigan 15:1	210:8,15,22
91:6,16 92:11,25	132:21 229:20	86:3	211:8,15,18
94:15 106:24	methodology	middle 110:7	212:5,7 213:4,18
108:10,13 109:7	38:2 77:3	205:24 210:10	213:21 215:4,21
109:23 110:5	131:22 150:10	miles 64:17	216:13 221:5,9
127:14 190:14	237:3	million 232:8	221:15,19
197:12 200:8	methods 18:19	233:2,5 234:11	261:14 262:13
224:14 240:20	83:17 129:14,15	mind 17:8 39:10	263:9 269:5,9
	153:25 231:4	41:14 46:20	

[minus - neatly]

Page 39

minus 141:14 142:24 minute 104:22 222:20 231:3 256:4 257:10 minutes 50:25 213:25 222:19 256:4 mira 253:2 misleading 219:2 misreading 144:15 missed 31:9 95:17 mistake 114:19 mistakes 143:23 mistaking 146:21 misuse 87:25 mit 230:13 253:6 mode 142:10 model 206:10 234:6 modeling 123:14 modified 234:14 234:20 236:25 modify 234:19 modifying 234:16 moment 44:16 68:11 70:18 71:18 78:22 96:16 111:24 113:23 115:16 120:7 130:14 139:7 153:20 173:10 177:12	202:24 227:7 255:18 moments 213:24 money 244:4 248:17 monitor 247:10 month 240:13 monthly 251:4 months 10:9 13:2 30:20 83:23 223:1,21 253:7 266:5 moon 1:22 3:3 5:12,18 6:1,16 11:1 195:24 237:22 271:5 272:2,24 273:2,4 273:12 morning 6:5 moseley 1:17 motion 99:18 216:19,23 217:3 217:4 motivation 102:13 215:4 motivations 191:4,7 215:19 motives 100:21 216:24 217:1 mouth 118:16 move 50:19 56:13 58:17 61:25 62:19 76:23 79:21 89:15 106:20 111:5 136:24 148:19 149:7,21 171:3	moved 77:9,22 78:20 191:15 194:19 moving 129:8 218:10,20 multifactorial 182:15 multiple 129:11 205:14 206:5 213:19 226:24 235:19,25 multiplying 199:18,20 200:2 municipal 64:11 105:16,21 108:7 municipalities 63:6 64:13,18 128:16 130:3 134:10 149:14 murphy 1:12 murrell 1:11 muscatel 64:25 mutual 111:16 mystifying 249:25	143:2 naacp2 57:4 65:2 143:7,17,25 144:22 145:2 166:2,10 167:12 173:3 263:25 naacpldf.org 3:8 3:9 271:2 name 6:5 23:7 110:2 120:4 138:19 197:7 220:21 228:18 238:20 241:24 241:25 253:3 named 70:1,9 79:14 99:14,16 102:22 133:2 135:4 137:17 names 6:15 narrative 80:14 82:14 83:9 94:10 narratives 80:18 national 74:7 226:5 232:1,4,12 255:9 nationally 65:17 nationwide 153:22 nature 27:20 102:13 103:8 250:5 256:9 ncsl 74:7 near 78:25 141:7 163:17 nearly 202:7 neatly 243:3
		n n 5:1 6:17,17 n.w. 3:14 naacp 1:3 3:3,4 10:13 54:22 58:13 63:16,21 96:8 178:1 264:8 271:4 272:1 273:1 naacp1 54:14,25 57:3,7 62:5 64:25 142:17	

<p>necessarily 72:2 72:10 87:2,14 88:15 101:15 112:11 122:22 122:24 123:2 140:4 153:22 221:16 229:22 necessary 122:21 168:20 246:7 273:6 need 6:23 7:23 21:25 22:13 98:15 130:15 156:10 160:5 216:23 243:17 245:20 249:22 256:4 257:10 needs 244:5 negative 203:24 neighborhood 140:7 neighborhoods 191:23 neighbors 78:18 neither 168:20 184:24 270:7 nest 218:25 nested 230:18 network 232:9 233:4 neutral 111:8 124:8,19,21,22 134:16 136:12 141:6 142:21 168:8 176:13,18 176:20 177:16 205:17,18 206:8 206:11,13,14,15</p>	<p>never 16:17 17:3 17:5,9 26:5 35:19 74:9 167:24,25 new 3:7,7,21,21 35:18 89:21 107:16 129:10 147:16 148:4 195:22 205:16 206:8 248:7 nexsen 4:3 nexsenpruet.c... 4:6 nfs 234:1 nights 238:23 nine 55:18,22,24 171:16,19,20 175:3 nod 7:1 nodding 91:20 nods 163:4 non 107:17 116:12 146:3 157:16,20 nondilution 263:5,9,14 nonpartisan 74:6 nonperforming 166:20 nonredistricting 26:6 north 17:19 18:5 23:17,18 24:4,17 24:20 25:5,11 98:9,13 105:17 106:2 239:3 253:22</p>	<p>nose 148:21 notary 270:3 273:13,19 note 45:1 48:8 75:24 89:20 119:6 198:3 202:1 271:10 noted 149:12 174:5 188:13 273:7 notice 5:12 10:25 11:10 noticed 164:7 notify 240:3 notion 121:24 notions 178:17 november 234:15 236:25 241:21 nsf 232:14,16,20 233:10 235:8 245:9 248:19 249:18 number 37:4 54:6,8,9,19 64:2 64:3 65:14,16,17 83:3,3 97:11 128:2 131:14 140:10 141:18 152:18 171:25 183:20 199:24 200:1,21 202:23 230:24 233:6 265:23 266:2 numbered 77:5 numbers 19:15 54:10 89:13 143:22 146:23</p>	<p>156:22 158:19 158:22,24 160:9 171:8,9,25 199:12,14,16 200:14 numeral 259:10 259:13 260:6,14 261:7,22 262:3 numerical 36:2 67:13 numerous 20:6 22:18 111:25 114:1 125:8 138:4 232:16,22 243:5 nygord 4:16</p>
			<p>o</p>
			<p>o 6:17,17 91:19 230:21 oakland 110:6 oath 6:19 246:21 object 7:8 130:8 256:8 objection 7:9 103:5 185:16 186:2 244:24 245:14 248:21 249:4,23 250:14 250:22 objectively 74:4 objectives 99:9 obligated 44:23 59:23,25 60:3,9 233:15 obligation 6:19 190:7,12,13,17 190:18 236:21</p>

obligations 240:23	okay 8:4 9:23 12:25 13:23	257:1,6,15 260:17 261:4	33:17,20 44:22 46:2 47:3 53:11
observation 98:5	31:18,20 35:4,5	old 178:23	59:22 64:19
observed 215:12	35:23 39:7 41:2	omit 67:9	97:12,15 145:13
obtaining 15:9	41:16 49:5	omitted 30:18	180:11 185:12
occasion 229:18	50:19 57:10,21	203:6 238:2,5	185:25 190:8
occasions 262:20	58:25 75:5	once 187:11	204:16,16,22
occur 13:8	76:25 81:19	191:25 218:15	205:3 208:16
occurred 91:7 127:19 143:4	84:24 86:2 89:14 92:2,21	one's 46:20	214:11 220:2,10
occurring 141:14	103:14 104:3,11 106:20 108:20	ones 18:2 42:16	220:23 231:14
october 266:14	109:6 110:12,22	67:12 82:24	opinions 34:22
offer 31:13,17 32:13 33:14 34:7 168:24	116:1,2 117:17 123:8 124:24 125:16 126:16	95:23 99:22,22 102:22 105:18 109:2,3,4 119:8	42:23 84:25 138:16 204:21 213:6,7,9 214:19
offered 77:16 124:12 192:4 269:12	129:1 135:17 136:23 140:8 143:24 146:25	128:5 131:9,11 132:15 179:9 190:25 200:16	214:25 215:17 248:14
offering 32:7 64:19 180:11	152:8 154:17 155:12 166:17	228:13	opponent 152:22
offers 231:1	178:7 193:11	ongoing 96:13	opportunities 189:14 190:4 205:17 206:8
office 25:2 239:2 239:6,8	194:4 204:3 209:3 211:2,21	online 224:16 236:24	opportunity 24:16 25:20 34:3,5,18 44:18
officers 11:25	212:13 223:7,25	open 49:11 52:10,13 86:5	53:2 112:1,2 114:1,3,5,8,14
offices 225:17	224:15 225:7,14	223:22,25	114:17,20 115:3 115:6,16,24
official 1:9,10,11 1:13,14,15,17 253:12 270:11	225:18 228:10 229:16 231:19 231:23 233:2,9	operational 229:14	116:3,6,22 117:4 117:19,22,24
officially 64:13	233:21 234:9,13	operationalize 125:1 132:12	118:3,9,11,13,18 119:1,10,18,23
officials 219:24	236:2 238:12 239:5,9,15,19,23	133:4,20 229:11 229:12	120:14 121:2,4 121:14 122:9
oh 16:17,23 48:10 52:9 132:22 145:20 146:18 157:15 177:10 199:25 201:6 202:23	241:16 242:3,19 244:15 245:24 246:12 247:17 247:21 249:10 253:18,25 254:6 254:22 256:3,7	operationalizing 82:16 opine 44:1 47:5 opining 117:3 opinion 11:17 32:7,13 33:1,3	123:19 138:7 145:19 149:23 162:8 163:22 168:6,9,17,21 177:5 178:4

188:4 189:18,20 190:1,7,16 202:9 202:17 206:25 207:3,6,7,15,20 207:21 208:1,12 208:14,19 209:6 209:7,9,16,21 210:1,8,16,23 211:16,18 215:5 215:21 216:14 221:6,10,15,19 250:11 opposed 13:9 39:12 48:22 52:24 77:13 81:23 137:11 145:11 163:23 210:1 249:21 opposite 94:8 optimize 96:25 97:22 optimizing 99:4 188:18 option 97:13 212:7 options 23:14 178:1 185:1 208:11 227:10 oral 80:14 orangeburg 79:8 88:25 106:24 107:2,6 order 20:16 28:17 60:6,10 117:11 118:24 121:18 122:8 131:10 155:23 156:6,11 158:5	179:11 180:18 181:15 183:5 247:6 249:19 250:19 259:21 259:25 260:3 organization 247:14,18 248:10 original 17:5 253:8 originally 253:2 outcome 177:20 179:11 180:18 182:9 183:5 235:22 268:9,17 outcomes 74:5 162:18 171:12 180:8 201:11 217:2 outlier 140:22 140:23 141:2 outposts 149:20 output 223:19 236:13 outputs 248:19 outright 119:3,7 154:19 outside 20:12 69:22 74:12 158:17 177:23 outweigh 188:3 overall 86:23 143:9 167:2 170:3 227:5 252:2 overhead 225:25 226:1	overlap 242:10 overlapping 235:13 overlaps 71:14 72:3 115:11 overperform 168:12 overperforms 167:4 overshot 131:17 overstate 164:10 overtake 70:3,8 owned 239:12,16 246:15 p p 5:19,21 196:16 197:18 p.m. 269:19 package 51:23 67:4 230:8 265:11 packaged 67:16 packages 51:25 52:3 224:4 packard 2:1 packed 138:11 packet 13:21 packing 138:22 page 5:1,11 34:1 35:2,14 36:13 40:12 42:21 59:10 60:16 61:8 63:4,11 69:16 76:5 77:20 82:1,4 88:24 90:4 93:2 94:20 99:6	105:12 106:23 108:6 124:6 125:20 126:3 127:13 128:8,11 132:16 136:25 139:7,20,21 140:2 143:13,16 145:1 149:9,25 154:10 158:1 159:10,19 164:18,20 165:8 166:1,9 171:3 172:4,5 176:8 181:11 196:24 196:24 201:24 202:10 231:24 231:24 263:21 264:3 266:9 272:4,7,10,13,16 272:19 pages 28:17 89:8 89:11 91:16 92:11 265:25 266:2 paid 28:5 29:15 224:20 225:3,5,8 225:13 242:23 243:16 244:3 pair 199:14 pairing 76:18,21 135:25 pairings 66:13 pandas 52:1,2 paper 16:25 83:16 230:9 235:16,16,19,21 235:22,24 236:3 236:12,15
--	--	--	---

[papers - percent]

Page 43

papers 8:10 84:8 84:11 122:4 129:12	242:9 243:24 253:16 255:19 263:1 268:10	194:7,12,15,21 201:11 215:3,19 216:15,24 217:1	penalize 59:16 pending 7:25 270:9
paragraph 43:7 44:5 48:9,10 58:4 109:12 172:7 177:11 190:19 202:1 203:19 205:10 205:24 217:10 217:14 262:11	participatory 84:6,8 particular 18:18 34:6 35:8 37:20 60:9 66:10 67:18 69:14 79:11 80:24 81:5 87:9 94:22 98:7 99:15 101:25 103:20 110:24 116:3 117:5,8,20 119:25 123:22 126:18 131:18 133:14 152:3 163:23 167:21 193:4 204:14 207:16 214:20 216:5 229:1 232:7 235:24 236:11,16 258:20 259:25 260:2	partisanship 99:15 100:19 101:11,16 193:20 partly 219:4 230:13 232:22 237:19 parts 64:12 144:3 168:11,13 231:7 party 119:2 152:22,23 153:3 153:20 163:11 170:8 192:17 270:8 pass 221:23 passing 199:3 paste 29:4 pastes 29:2 patience 70:19 pattern 178:25 179:5 194:7 patterns 46:18 114:22 167:22 pause 37:14 266:10 pay 225:18 226:10 263:8 pedantic 229:24 peer 16:3,11,13 16:15 83:21 120:25 121:9,14 121:24 129:11 131:23 137:23 223:19 230:9	pennsylvania 17:19 18:5 19:9 24:12,19 25:1 60:7 people 9:8 25:3 37:4 46:7,13 57:4 74:21 86:7 91:8 110:21 113:6 121:13 131:9,16 133:1 152:15 163:8,8 163:10 178:10 178:10,13 204:5 214:15 218:18 223:12,17 224:16 225:2 226:20 227:13 227:14,25 243:18 255:19 264:4 people's 20:14 23:5 perceive 246:6 perceived 245:20 percent 54:14 55:12,16,19 56:4 56:8 57:14 65:10,17 116:18 116:19 117:22 119:17 120:20 126:4,4,5,18 127:6,10,20 128:3,6 131:6 139:14 140:4,6,7
parameters 136:17 147:14 147:17 176:23 paraphrase 22:3 22:9 58:9 113:24 parcel 212:1 parentheses 177:17 parsing 220:3 part 11:16,18 13:9 14:14 20:17 21:7,12,23 22:15 23:21 34:22 40:14 52:15,23 53:17 53:18,21 54:3 70:20 83:2 84:7 101:2 107:10 116:15 133:7 188:14 192:13 193:20 204:15 212:1 213:15 223:9,16 225:6,9 226:8 227:8 229:17 233:25 236:8 240:23	parties 244:18 partisan 23:22 24:15 25:19,23 34:8 68:4,6,8 75:12 100:21 135:22 190:21 190:24 191:3,4,6 191:11 192:9,12 192:20 193:18		

[percent - plan]

Page 44

140:10 141:7,14 141:21,21,24 142:1,2,4,8,8,16 142:20,22,23 144:4 145:4 148:9,12 154:20 154:21 156:15 157:16,20 159:23,25 160:13,20 161:1 161:15,16,19 162:1 165:10,19 165:20,22,23 166:10,12 168:15 173:16 173:22,25 174:2 174:2,19 175:6 176:13 177:16 198:21 199:4,18 199:19 202:8 226:2,5 244:6 264:19 percentage 37:1 114:20 142:24 158:15 173:14 173:20 175:18 175:22,24 176:6 176:7 percentages 156:2,8 202:2 perfect 206:12 233:8 perfectly 152:20 258:13 perform 133:8 169:4 172:21 202:20	performance 68:4,6,8 135:23 152:2,2 155:19 168:1,3 181:14 182:7,8,20 performed 132:9 performing 227:3 performs 62:5,8 62:10 63:15 64:25 161:14,19 166:19 201:3,3 201:11,14 period 36:18 periodically 247:4 permissible 104:10 person 47:19 56:25 57:20 58:12,15 91:4 126:10,22 127:2 127:4,6,11,18,23 215:22 229:18 229:19 232:15 personal 246:2 personally 28:14 121:5 154:3 persons 1:6 persuasive 21:22 pertains 71:16 phase 233:3 238:7 257:17,23 258:2 phd 1:22 3:3 5:18 6:1 14:10 15:9 195:25 256:7,22,22,23	271:5 272:2,24 273:2,4,12 phenomena 166:25 phrase 33:10 34:21 37:5 46:7 61:2 68:11,11 71:10,13 74:19 76:2 78:8 87:12 95:12 121:19 138:21 169:25 178:8,15 259:1,3 phrased 214:1 phraseology 118:17 phrases 110:11 121:15 phrasing 176:10 183:3 208:6 257:18 260:9 physical 59:18 225:15 pi 232:14,15,16 picked 38:18 39:24 picture 106:17 106:18 143:10 pictured 194:12 piece 24:2 168:4 218:8,21 226:8 pieces 63:17,18 75:16 piggyback 234:10 piggybacked 234:5 pl94-171 36:12	place 8:19 9:3 10:3 48:17 98:18 191:2 192:20 205:4 266:14 placed 16:25 131:5 211:1 placement 191:13 places 54:2 67:21 110:18 119:6 120:8 132:24 163:16 164:5 179:16 191:16 259:7 plain 208:9 212:9 plaintiff's 11:24 12:10,16 13:14 88:23 plaintiffs 1:7 3:2 11:25 216:23 plan 20:3 23:19 30:11 31:19,19 31:23 32:8,14 33:1,7,19 35:7 45:17 54:19,22 55:1,25 56:24 57:13 58:11,13 58:13,14,24 59:24 60:14 62:4,9 63:15 64:24 70:2 79:17,22 90:20 93:5,7,18 94:12 94:13 95:14 96:3,17,18 97:2 97:6,7 106:3
---	--	--	--

107:3,13,16,17	220:18 221:7	85:3 104:2	242:16 246:19
108:15,19 109:1	261:12	112:19 126:11	246:21,22,25
111:9 129:8,8,16	plan's 139:12	126:15 144:15	247:3 249:7
129:20,21	plans 20:5 21:11	146:21 177:14	250:2 262:16
135:19 136:13	30:12 32:23	200:22 262:6	263:13
140:9 142:16	52:21 54:7	plot 79:3 137:6,8	political 43:16
143:3,17,20	55:14,18 56:1,3	plural 229:19	46:17,25 47:25
144:7,11,13,17	56:7 57:7,8 61:7	plurality 152:24	48:2,13 49:2
144:20,22,24	63:16 66:14	159:17,18 160:4	62:1,20 63:6,12
145:3,7,21 146:5	67:20 94:21	plus 141:14	177:7,8 178:5,12
147:2 149:17	96:8 97:11	142:23	178:24 179:2,5
153:6 154:7,12	98:10 99:24	pmc 23:8,9,11	180:24 192:12
155:2,7 158:17	125:1,13 126:9	point 42:3 82:11	220:5,7 256:24
159:2,11,21	127:15,17,21	87:14 119:7,12	259:21,24
160:22 161:2,4	128:1 131:19	119:17 123:15	politics 252:8
161:14,22	132:1,2,4,7	145:18 162:7,9	polsby 58:20,23
164:25 165:1,15	133:11,16 134:2	182:17 192:8	59:6,12 62:11
166:2,16 167:14	134:16,18 135:7	195:11 198:15	77:6
173:11,24	135:13,14	200:4 202:10	popper 58:20,23
174:18 175:4,8	136:14,16,17,21	210:5 221:23	59:6,12 62:11
176:3,3,5,15	139:10 141:6,17	222:1 251:24	77:6
177:18 178:2	142:21 143:8,9	pointed 181:23	popular 59:14
181:4,25 184:7	145:13,18,20	pointing 189:8	population
184:20 185:1,13	146:11,15,16	points 19:14	21:10,13 36:6
186:14 187:4,9	147:12,12,13	88:8,9,11 142:24	37:8,8,9 39:14
187:18,22	148:2,5,7 149:17	197:14	39:16 46:12,12
188:10 189:15	152:19 167:12	polarization	53:14 56:13
190:3,4,22	171:23 172:21	157:11 168:7	57:14,20 58:1,12
191:18 198:19	173:1 181:25	polarized 113:18	64:4,8,14,18
199:5,6,9,10,10	184:6 189:9	150:3,14,15,20	65:5,9,11,20
199:19,23,24	199:13,14,15	150:24 157:9,18	66:9 78:12 86:9
200:18 201:7,8	209:4 262:8	172:12,18	110:16,18,25
201:17,18 202:3	268:13	174:14	111:15,25 113:4
202:3,6,15	play 96:4 97:3	pole 175:15	113:5,25 117:13
208:18 209:8,15	183:7	policies 227:12	125:22,25 126:4
213:14 215:5,13	played 20:8,11	policy 63:8	126:7 127:2
217:12,12,18	please 6:15,24	226:13 228:5	128:3 138:3,6
218:5,23,24,25	14:3 28:7 71:1	235:8 239:25	160:13 167:2

184:22 187:5,10 189:3,12,22 198:21 199:5 205:13,15 206:5 206:6 210:19 213:18,21 262:21 263:16 264:14,20 populous 57:18 57:19 86:18 88:12 port 90:6 porter 10:20,22 portion 79:24 110:5 144:6 199:1 237:5 portions 166:23 pose 7:9 posit 209:22 position 15:4 43:18 108:25 186:5 240:21,24 positions 14:24 positive 203:24 possibilities 102:12 113:16 possibility 99:12 99:12 107:9,21 112:22 116:8,10 116:12 121:11 122:8 246:13 possible 32:22 38:20 52:13 80:16 90:14 93:13 94:4,9 99:20 104:17 112:14,25 113:3 117:10,13,21	118:1 122:25 132:4 157:10 160:10,12,14 163:13 166:25 168:13 188:17 188:19 206:13 208:8 215:10 220:24 221:17 239:15,19 242:2 246:16 249:8 258:9,14 possibly 19:22 87:17 post 14:24 224:19 postdoctoral 223:14 potentially 138:12 204:20 power 111:10 powerful 130:6 178:21 practical 122:6 259:20 260:2 practice 38:20 66:6 97:23 267:8 practices 73:22 73:25 74:8 75:1 243:8 247:7 practitioner 167:25 precede 179:22 260:7 precinct 36:7 50:14 109:23 110:1,2 200:19 217:24 218:2	219:8,10 220:17 222:8 precincts 30:23 35:7 36:7,10 89:21,25 117:8 192:12,24 193:1 193:4,4 200:6 218:9,9,11,17,24 219:13,23 220:6 220:11 precise 19:4 56:22 58:8,22 152:17 171:5 186:5 precisely 80:19 132:15 predictions 123:13 predominance 33:14 168:23 192:9 predominate 34:10 predominated 33:6,17 34:16 190:23 predominates 34:7 preference 131:25 132:1,6 149:12 170:3 259:22 260:3 preferences 128:19 preferred 51:23 61:15 83:8 114:11 116:20 118:10 120:15	121:19 122:22 153:2,10,16,20 154:2 158:16 159:3,8,12,24 160:5 161:14 162:10 170:21 173:25 preferring 94:7 94:8 preloaded 66:21 premise 110:20 preparation 8:15 9:2,10 prepare 8:13 28:21 29:1 prepared 26:17 26:20 99:24 260:25 preparing 12:17 26:24 27:8 30:15 258:1 presence 128:13 162:11 168:6 182:23 present 4:16 8:24 9:7 108:15 113:12 120:19 146:8 172:12 190:3 194:3,16 presentations 74:6 presented 28:15 51:14 55:4 66:2 123:16 193:9 208:11 209:5,17 preservation 49:13 69:12 72:8 73:5,11
---	---	---	--

76:22 99:1	prevents 100:20	181:8,14,19,20	privately 101:24
128:15 130:2	100:23 184:22	181:24 183:4	probabilistic
131:5,7,10,25	189:3 208:3,7	188:12,16	129:15
132:10 135:14	preview 61:19	190:24 202:16	probabilistically
149:13 199:24	previous 43:8	203:7 204:8	130:22
200:1 202:21	54:11 55:3	209:14 210:17	probability
203:4,11 205:13	106:9 122:13	210:25 212:23	122:8 123:5,9,10
206:3 208:13	154:6 155:25	220:13 231:11	129:16 132:6,7
209:7,21 213:18	158:9 172:21	267:4	134:25
214:7,13 215:3	198:19 203:9	prior 12:2 49:13	probably 16:5
221:18	previously 10:12	77:17 80:9,13,20	89:8 162:23
preserve 220:25	primarily 180:6	107:17 203:20	179:16 189:19
preserved	215:2	204:10 205:19	189:21 200:3
107:16	primary 164:8	prioritization	219:9 237:19
preserving 50:10	164:16 223:17	101:3	239:7 241:19
72:1 75:24 76:3	224:19	prioritize 130:22	probative
76:19 98:19	princeton	132:10,14,18	118:21 121:4,8
201:4 204:22	256:23	210:22 211:17	151:2 174:6
216:15 220:1,8	principal 203:21	211:24 221:7,18	177:19 179:24
president 1:10	232:14 233:22	prioritized 94:24	185:11 201:14
presume 47:8	principle 25:16	103:8 180:25	201:21 268:14
pretty 146:11	48:12 70:1	260:21,22	probe 205:8
207:22	190:16 203:4,12	prioritizes 212:7	problem 126:8
prevail 114:12	204:6,23 205:2,3	prioritizing	160:15 165:22
122:23,24 123:2	210:7 214:5	99:14 100:9,21	problematic
155:23 156:7,11	216:7 220:2,9	104:14	138:24
156:19 158:5	243:2 262:24	priority 42:7,15	problems 131:3
159:25 169:18	principles 24:1	69:16,20 207:21	procedural 46:5
170:11	24:18 33:7,15,21	211:4,16 260:6	47:15
prevailed 121:23	70:4,8 74:2,9,20	260:15	proceedings
122:14,16	74:22 75:1	private 99:21	51:2 92:22
prevailing	77:15 97:21	100:24 101:15	105:1 148:23
123:11 153:3	99:3,21,22,25	101:18 102:8,12	195:14 266:10
170:19	100:3,6 103:2	102:13,15,16	process 27:5,5
prevent 189:25	134:19,20	103:12,24 104:6	37:25 45:18
250:19	147:20 149:10	104:15 266:24	96:15 97:11
prevented 68:25	179:10,21 180:7	267:5,11,14,17	129:8,11 205:17
	180:18,21 181:7	267:19,22	205:18 206:9,10

206:11,13,14,15 231:2 267:1,6 produce 11:17 97:20 178:18 produced 235:1 235:6 237:1,8,16 238:6 243:13 246:1 produces 129:10 131:8 producing 131:11 product 27:22 39:21 217:25 219:21 products 30:8 professional 2:5 14:13,19 213:10 professor 15:5 130:14 223:7 225:6 226:11 230:12,13 professorial 240:23 profile 225:6 profits 255:21 progeny 261:17 program 15:19 125:12,17 128:18 149:11 224:23 232:25 233:11 252:11 programmed 147:1 programming 230:5 programs 224:1 241:23 265:8	prohibit 71:20 72:21 73:10,15 73:20 prohibited 102:17 103:24 prohibition 100:14 101:10 101:17 104:4,13 project 90:6 227:22 228:5 projects 254:10 promote 130:18 promoted 129:24 promotes 129:12 promotions 15:5 pronounced 59:1 proper 101:3,3 101:23 properly 127:8 130:15 properties 127:7 127:24 133:11 133:16 134:17 136:13 264:23 property 143:3 proportion 129:23 proportionality 178:17 proposal 94:16 95:11,16 235:10 proposals 235:19 propose 119:19 proposed 21:16 120:17 184:19	264:1 proprietary 224:10,13 protection 101:2 188:3 212:24 213:2 protocols 126:17 provide 9:19 12:17,20,23 13:11,23 32:3 33:11,13 74:3 85:25 86:4 88:20 117:21 190:12 198:6 199:15 207:2,5 208:24 provided 10:7 11:14,24 12:7,14 13:1,9 17:18 20:13,17 21:8 23:10 24:20 27:19 30:19 66:19 150:14,16 150:18 186:6 193:23 194:25 195:4,5,8 228:1 provides 32:2 119:22 202:16 228:3 providing 115:6 provision 98:11 provisions 103:20 proxied 134:8 proxies 221:12 proxy 162:8 168:3	pruet 4:3 public 13:10 28:9,13,14 79:7 80:1,4,12,22 81:8,15,21 82:4 82:19,22 83:15 84:9 85:8,21,22 85:25 86:1,16,16 86:20 87:2,9 88:10,20 89:5,7 89:24 90:3,12,24 91:3,7 92:8,16 92:23 93:9,22 95:2,9,21,23 96:9 99:23 100:10 101:21 103:13 104:15 107:5,18 108:21 109:10 111:2 132:11,24 183:8 183:9,12,15,18 183:19,23 192:1 192:6,15,21 204:17 224:12 224:13 226:22 228:15,20 229:4 229:7,12 262:16 263:18 265:18 266:6 267:1,6,9 270:3 273:19 publication 235:6 236:3,9 237:2,8,13,16 238:5 publications 16:4,11,13 234:25 237:1
--	---	--	--

[publicly - quoted]

Page 49

publicly 30:11 99:21 100:1,2,5 100:24 101:14 104:7	python 51:22 52:6,9 124:24 224:2,8 228:25	58:25 62:3 65:4 65:23 66:5 72:1 72:17,20 74:19 75:20 84:4,16 85:4,10,24 88:8 92:18 93:16 95:7 101:6,16,16 102:18,24 103:23,25 104:12 112:17 115:25 116:23 122:12 146:19 149:6 156:14 157:13,24 161:24,25 162:20,22 164:1 164:9,17 166:22 175:17,19 177:7 179:18 181:18 181:21 186:4 187:15 190:9,10 203:3 205:18 209:11 217:6 220:3 221:11 222:10 225:20 236:19 237:11 243:12 245:7 249:24 250:16 263:2 266:12 267:15 268:1,24	261:5 263:16 264:24 265:17 266:23 268:2,22 quibble 174:21 quick 11:7 41:13 62:2 quickly 127:6,22 220:20 264:21 266:8 quite 16:5,23 18:17 46:19 53:14 54:6 70:7 71:19 73:2 74:6 78:7 82:15 85:6 92:10 94:6 123:16 130:5 138:20 142:9 143:11 145:16 156:23 192:19 199:12 215:14 215:16 218:22 226:14 227:19 243:9 250:6 252:15 258:21 quo 221:9 quote 57:11 59:10 60:25 63:10 68:10 79:9 90:9 93:12 94:3 113:22 153:1 184:10,19 185:3 187:23 211:14 259:19 262:7 quoted 60:20 91:4 184:15 189:17
publish 16:18,19 published 16:16 16:17 17:3,5 52:20 75:17 117:15 183:16 214:5 pull 9:21 17:16 29:9 41:7,12 43:3 76:16 121:18 216:21 256:5 pulled 22:1 57:21 105:9 pulling 215:25 pure 15:12 purple 78:23,25 purpose 127:4 182:9 213:21 246:18 261:14 purposes 22:19 226:23 246:23 255:21 256:1 pursuant 233:21 pursue 99:10 pursuing 263:13 put 48:22 65:21 118:16 129:16 130:12,19 138:21 164:16 205:4 putting 130:21 puzzle 168:4 218:21	qualified 19:19 19:21 47:5 qualifies 47:2 qualify 21:6 24:8 qualifying 117:1 qualitative 61:11,16 77:13 77:17 83:10,13 84:13 181:3 182:18 192:5 193:21 194:19 qualitatively 97:22 quality 231:11 quantification 83:16 84:1 quantitate 84:13 quantitative 32:5 77:13 84:1 182:17 192:4 193:9 194:3,17 194:19 quantitatively 135:9 quantity 36:2 61:16 question 6:25 7:8,11,15,16,18 7:25 8:1 9:23 12:20 21:7,14 32:19 34:13,23 40:1 44:25 48:1 51:19,20 52:22	questions 8:17 14:2 67:6 108:18 109:1,2,7 196:11 198:11 198:16 221:23 221:24 222:1,2 222:17 223:4 256:9 258:18,24	

[quoting - rebuttal]

Page 50

quoting 45:15	racially 113:18	202:17 207:14	219:21 227:9
r	150:3,13,15,20	208:15,23,23	232:22 234:2
r 91:19 160:19	150:23 157:9,18	213:8,11 215:10	239:9 248:6
230:21 272:3,3	172:11,17	245:5 259:14	249:13 251:5
race 31:24 32:9	174:14 194:15	260:4 261:12	reason 7:23
33:2,6,17,22,24	194:20 217:2	262:5,10 271:9	37:11 38:9
34:10,16,20,21	radcliffe 241:14	273:5	39:17 40:5
34:25 44:20,23	254:8,9	reader 70:6	48:21 52:23
45:11,13,14,17	raise 225:21	176:20	93:21 96:1
45:23 46:6,14,18	raised 258:7	readers 64:21	107:22 109:15
46:22,24 47:13	ramifications	reading 58:2	143:6 178:14
101:4 103:19,22	221:15	69:8,15 70:14	208:13 218:12
133:25 134:1,4,7	ran 241:23	76:5 80:6 140:2	218:18 234:18
134:13 147:4	random 85:23	166:5 184:11	235:4 237:6,13
160:17 170:24	86:9 129:3,9	202:4 207:23	238:10 243:18
171:1 176:13,18	130:8,12 131:4	208:9 209:12	243:24 245:19
176:20 177:16	randomized	210:5,13,21	247:19 248:12
214:8,14 220:25	130:9	211:6 212:3,11	248:23 254:23
221:10,12,13	randomness	213:22 259:17	266:16 271:11
261:5 262:21	129:14 235:15	269:20	272:6,9,12,15,18
263:7,12	range 123:23	reads 213:20	272:21
races 149:24	140:4 141:22,23	215:18	reasonable 70:6
150:19 151:12	142:20,23	ready 221:23	88:13,16 97:9
171:13,16,20	ranked 43:22	real 41:13	114:12 118:11
173:12 174:1,3	207:18	realistic 115:18	119:1 122:19
175:3,4 201:21	rankin 1:10 2:3	118:13,15,17	123:24 167:25
201:22	3:12 6:8	119:9,18,22	204:19
racial 24:1 33:14	rapid 234:1,4	120:14 121:11	reasoning 134:6
52:14 101:25	rarely 239:4	121:13 122:7	reasons 39:11,20
125:4,6,10 134:8	ratings 168:2	178:19	64:16 132:25
134:10 157:11	reaching 32:4	realized 30:17	133:2 182:24
168:23 170:3	read 28:14 54:13	really 65:24	183:7
190:21,23 191:2	58:3 76:12 80:1	84:12 86:14	reassigned 78:3
191:3,6,10 192:9	80:4,21 143:22	97:4 103:7	reassignment
194:13 216:24	150:21,23	121:23 128:22	77:24 79:5
221:5 262:13	172:14 177:11	138:20 142:6	rebuttal 31:9,11
263:12	177:13 182:5,10	163:25 189:6	31:13 197:8,13
	184:10 196:21	205:4 218:25	198:1,12 231:5

[recall - regardless]

Page 51

recall 9:17,25 10:2 19:8 27:2 28:25 30:21,25 38:14,17 48:7 90:12 91:13 92:2,7 108:21,22 110:1 139:17 197:4 201:16 220:15,19 234:24 238:9 257:15 258:17 258:23 261:4 263:15 264:24 265:1,10,17,20 265:21 266:23 267:2 268:2 269:5 recalling 77:4 receipt 271:18 receive 98:2 233:23 received 28:9 96:5 154:20 204:17 232:8,11 238:17 254:1,22 256:23 258:5 receives 158:16 160:6 recognize 121:6 196:2 recognizing 133:3 recollection 269:11 recombination 230:19 231:10 235:2 236:9 237:14	reconcile 218:17 reconstituted 120:7,12 121:6,7 171:17,22 195:6 reconstruct 254:7 record 6:15 7:1 13:10 40:2 51:3 76:5 83:8,9 85:8 85:21,23 88:2 90:12 92:8,20 94:10 104:23,25 105:2 148:25 164:23 183:8,9 183:13,18,19,21 183:22 195:13 195:16 222:21 270:6 recorded 51:12 156:14 191:1 recording 212:24 records 19:23 152:17 233:19 255:7 rector 3:6 red 105:14,16 108:7 143:1 redefine 124:15 redirect 256:10 256:11 268:25 269:1 redistricting 5:15,16 6:8 9:16 10:6,7 14:14,17 15:23,25 16:1,4 17:11,22 18:15 18:17,22 23:19	40:13,15 41:17 41:19,24 42:3 49:19,23 58:11 70:2,3,8 74:4,22 84:12 85:22 96:23,23 103:18 120:9 126:18,20 127:12 129:6 131:3 134:23 184:20 203:21 211:22 212:1 214:5 218:18 223:5,11,18,24 224:2 226:17 230:20 235:3 236:10 237:15 241:17 242:5,11 242:22 247:1 251:3,19 252:20 254:10,24 255:5 255:16 258:19 261:8,12 262:7 265:3,11 267:1,8 redraw 217:23 217:24 redrawn 147:19 redrew 217:22 218:2 reduce 65:16 reduced 168:9 207:3,5,6,11,25 215:20 216:13 224:25 236:17 236:21 240:25 251:21 reduces 112:2 reduction 205:15 206:7,24	207:14 241:3 refer 31:19 46:7 75:15 91:19 152:16 205:20 213:1,5 232:11 reference 41:21 61:12 212:23 224:8 243:20 269:4 referenced 31:2 49:16 75:4 177:9 224:1 271:6 references 230:24 269:4 referencing 61:4 referred 50:4 176:17 205:18 206:16 214:15 referring 42:8 43:12 50:7 68:18 74:1 93:19 96:11 112:10 134:24 141:9 191:12 192:22 198:1 202:13 224:9,10 refers 42:22 69:22 74:20 193:17 reflected 55:8 85:7 99:13 189:14 228:1 reflects 36:2 refresh 137:5 184:18 regardless 88:4 170:24
---	--	--	---

region 94:25 192:18 regions 94:23 229:14 regularly 247:10 reinststituted 120:4 rejected 16:16 17:9 rejections 16:24 related 11:17 12:24 95:19 103:18 197:15 252:4 254:10 263:12 270:8 relates 129:17 235:19 relating 226:10 relationship 183:10 245:2 relationships 251:8 relative 95:21 168:8 182:6,8 202:2 208:7 relatively 143:2 143:5 163:16 released 37:21 95:23 releases 38:1 relevance 53:16 122:2 relevant 28:24 67:22 127:11,23 133:17 191:21 213:8,11 214:19 216:10 218:22 250:19,25	relied 30:7,14 relief 137:14 rely 74:25 226:20 231:9,12 242:23 remedial 22:13 117:3 remedy 22:7 remember 37:14 37:24 41:6 140:5 202:25 203:1 223:1 234:15 241:25 252:16 257:18 257:19 264:2 266:12 268:7 remind 176:1 reminder 240:12 reminding 176:20 remove 46:24 renovated 247:25 renovation 248:5 rent 225:18 reock 58:20,23 59:1,6,11 62:9 62:12 repair 35:6 repairing 200:5 repairs 193:1 repeat 39:24 104:8 210:11 266:20 repeatedly 174:5 185:5 188:13	repeats 187:25 repetition 138:3 187:12 repetitively 33:9 rephrase 34:12 81:12 104:1 135:6 162:22 210:4 250:16 254:3 rephrasing 81:17 250:23 report 5:13,19 5:21 9:19,21 10:1 19:13 23:23 26:9,10,14 26:17,25,25 27:3 27:9,12,14,16,17 28:2 29:7 30:6 30:15 31:2,9,9 31:11,12,13 33:25 34:1,22 35:2,15,18 38:5 38:12 40:12 41:21 43:2 50:5 50:17 51:6,7 59:9 61:11,17 64:19,21 67:22 68:8 75:2,4 76:16 79:25 81:3 82:1,23 84:19 85:2,14 99:19 105:8 106:23 112:9,19 112:20,21 117:15 118:22 131:20 136:5 137:6 139:21 143:14 144:4,6	145:17 146:20 149:16,19 150:22,25 158:24 167:7 172:15 177:24 179:16 180:15 186:21 188:16 190:11,25 191:20 193:10 193:12 194:3,17 194:23 195:1,4 196:13,16,23,25 197:1,5,8,11,13 197:18,25 198:1 198:4,12,19 199:1,16 200:15 200:21 201:14 205:19,22,23 214:20,21 215:6 215:10,18 216:19 218:6,13 219:2 224:7 226:23 228:16 228:23 231:5,7 231:14 235:22 237:6 238:23 239:21 240:2 243:15 245:11 246:14 259:5 263:22,22 266:8 266:13 report's 203:10 reported 2:4 194:22 reporter 2:5 5:8 6:22,23,25 15:14 184:11,18 270:1 270:3,17
--	---	--	--

reporting 64:20 219:19	republicans 154:2 163:9	researchers 140:20	198:1,6 205:22 205:23 234:7
reports 9:13 10:7 12:18 13:12,13,15 17:17 21:9 23:23 26:20 31:3,5,22 33:5 80:9,13,20 180:13 240:10 258:1 261:1 268:8	require 45:10 106:11 114:14 114:17 117:20 147:2 208:17,21 208:23 209:24 240:2	residences 76:10 residency 66:17 residential 46:18 109:24 179:5 residents 86:4 86:24 87:3,21 88:2 90:7 116:20	responsibility 250:1 responsive 13:19 13:24 21:13 85:4 189:5 rest 90:1 134:15 restate 82:10 restrain 69:3 restricted 92:22 restriction 139:25
represent 6:7 12:21,22 86:17 86:23 87:2,5 88:11 116:21 133:6 143:1 158:10 223:2 245:22	requirement 209:2 requirements 40:23 42:13,14 42:18 43:14,16 44:16 47:23 49:3,6 57:25 69:18,19 72:13 98:12 117:12 118:3 127:12 211:3,15 219:19	resistant 140:21 resisting 115:14 resources 88:1 227:20 246:23 respect 48:19 88:20 91:14 95:15 100:2 110:12 127:25 132:1 134:16 146:10 149:18 181:4 182:2 192:25 200:18 209:13 217:7 259:3 263:17	restrictions 72:14 102:5 result 38:22 73:3 98:21 112:23 169:6,10 235:1,6 237:8,16 238:6 243:14 268:21 resulting 175:24 245:10
representation 53:25 206:12 268:21	requires 212:20 rereading 137:6 research 15:2,10 15:22 27:10,18 28:8,18,21 29:1 128:23 129:5 158:10 223:18 224:24 226:24 227:1,2,21 228:1 235:1,7 236:4,18 236:21 237:2,4,9 237:17 238:6 240:17 243:2 244:1,2 248:18 249:2 252:11,19	respected 109:8 respectively 264:10,11 respond 197:14 214:21 responding 53:17 215:2 257:19 response 5:20 13:17 32:11 35:2 97:9 197:10,13,17	results 30:24,25 103:21 151:8 158:2 174:23 175:1,4,8 194:9 201:17 237:2 retained 9:18 10:8,12,18,22 257:16,19 retainer 258:10 258:15 retention 67:14 67:16,19,21 68:22 199:9,20 201:9,24 202:2,7 203:9,20 204:6,7 210:2,21,23
representations 214:23			
representative 72:6 87:20 266:17			
representatives 1:12,13,14 12:1 30:10			
represented 178:2 247:17			
representing 238:11			
republican 152:22 170:8,12 170:15 192:19 268:4			

[retention - rmg]

Page 54

215:19 retirement 72:6 return 145:1 164:18 165:8 166:1 213:16 271:13,17 reunified 79:13 revenue 251:4 review 9:9,12 11:13 12:5,11,13 16:16 20:18 21:16 22:2 28:12,18,19 30:16 40:14 51:10 61:7,24 68:21 76:24 83:10,13,16 91:8 92:22 95:1 97:12 132:24 179:19 182:19 183:21,22 191:25 192:6,12 193:21 202:5 211:2 228:19 229:7 230:10 231:11 260:24 271:7 reviewed 8:16 9:13,15 11:20 16:3,11,13 31:4 31:5,10 67:15 83:21 120:25 121:9,14,24 129:11 131:23 137:23 168:11 200:16 201:12 213:7 216:1 223:19 230:9	265:18,22 reviewing 28:9 31:8 215:12 226:22 228:15 229:4 revised 17:6 revises 202:6 revived 17:9 richardson 228:2,18 238:21 right 7:6 16:2 19:10 22:5,20 23:6 26:2,6 27:18 29:8,10,11 30:3 31:6,7 35:14 36:19,22 37:2,4,5 38:13 39:1 40:24 42:18 43:11,13 49:5 50:14 52:17 53:5 54:1 54:2,16,20,21 55:17,20 56:1,4 56:9,16 57:1,2,5 58:7,21,22 60:20 61:1,5,6,22 62:6 62:7,9,10,15,19 62:25 63:1,11,18 63:19,23,24 64:3 64:4,5 65:1 66:14 71:18,19 72:11,23,24 73:6 73:7,12 75:7,8 76:8,19,20,23 78:15 79:4,8 80:6,7 82:6 84:2 85:3 86:13 87:10,11 89:6,17	89:19,22,23 93:2 93:3,17 95:18 98:2,3 100:11 101:11,12,20 102:3 104:19 105:8,20,21,25 106:3,7,8,12 107:15 108:9,12 109:1,5,22 110:7 110:8 111:5,20 112:16,20 115:19 116:7 118:5,6,11 120:10,11 125:14,15 128:4 128:6,11,14,17 129:24 132:2,3 136:19 137:3 139:14,15 140:12,13 141:4 141:7,12 142:2,3 142:17,18,21 145:6,6 146:8 147:3,7,23 148:3 148:4,9 149:21 151:9,25 152:12 152:20 154:8,24 155:10,13 156:7 158:12 159:1,4,5 159:7,14,17 160:10,23,24 161:4,17,24 162:5,6,16 164:25 165:6,7 165:14,17,18 166:6,17 167:10 169:9,23 170:5 170:20 171:6,7	171:14,24 172:2 172:9,23,24 173:1,19 174:4 174:24 176:8,24 182:4,22 183:5 183:18 184:17 186:1,15 193:3 193:15,16,25 194:24 195:8 197:2 198:7,9 202:4,22 204:15 204:24 206:1,2,9 207:16 211:22 212:1 218:7 224:3,22 229:9 233:7,13,13 235:8 236:19 238:14,25 241:2 241:22 247:23 248:2 252:12 255:1,23 256:21 259:15 260:16 262:1 264:6 266:4 267:24 rights 18:21 101:1 120:9 212:20,22 213:3 223:24 232:25 251:8,11 261:16 261:24 262:9 rises 190:18 209:1 risk 187:12 267:22 rivers 59:19 110:18 rmg 1:8
--	---	---	--

[road - scrutiny]

Page 55

road 110:6,24	run 51:17 64:17	90:5 95:10	226:5 230:10
roads 109:24	102:23 126:25	106:8 107:15	232:1,4,9,12
roberts 65:1	199:8 223:10,11	132:9 133:24	233:4 256:24
robust 226:12	265:7,13	134:15 136:12	sciences 15:2
robustness 133:7	running 27:23	137:13,21	scientific 230:6
role 20:11,17	27:24,25 226:21	139:15 145:3	230:15
23:21 24:22	228:14	150:12 154:18	scientist 82:15
32:2,5,23 74:21	runs 64:15 89:8	176:12 179:7	186:20
101:3 103:17,21	110:13,15 126:3	184:5 186:13	scientists 25:9
117:9	132:10,12	187:14 189:10	scope 32:2 46:1
roles 20:8	134:12	190:20 198:3,5	score 59:14 77:6
226:12 243:3	rushing 171:18	198:18 207:22	77:7 98:20
roll 257:12	s	208:2 211:3	176:14 177:18
roman 259:10	s 5:10 272:3	212:21 213:23	202:7
259:13 260:6,14	sacrificed	216:2 233:15	scores 58:23
261:7,22 262:3	180:24	234:14 236:24	59:6,7,11,16
room 8:8 123:23	sacrificing	238:12 259:19	scott 1:5,17
rooted 43:9,17	221:19	262:7,12	192:18 271:4
186:24,25	salient 53:19	sc 57:3 62:5	272:1 273:1
roots 84:10	191:24	63:16 64:25	scrambled
roughly 209:23	salients 35:9	65:2 144:22	147:18,19
221:5,9,9	sample 86:9,22	145:2 166:2,10	screen 11:4,7,9
round 54:9 67:6	sampling 134:25	167:12	26:9 35:17
233:6	san 253:22	scattered 77:25	41:17 48:10,11
routine 264:16	sat 25:3	78:8	51:6 57:22
routinely 77:19	satisfied 187:2,3	scenario 112:14	62:18 70:16
126:23	saw 156:22	153:16 157:16	105:10 124:6
row 54:11	189:2 226:16	209:17,18	164:21 196:14
rpv 150:5,8	saying 21:7	scholarly 223:18	scripts 27:25
153:25	32:11 54:13	244:10	226:22 228:14
rule 7:14 182:23	58:5 72:9 89:16	scholars 223:14	scroll 59:20,21
239:22	95:13 135:1,3	scholarship	60:16 63:4
rules 72:17	152:1 236:3	15:10,25 236:22	scrupulous
125:2,12,14	says 28:2 37:9	243:19,20 244:7	227:19 250:6
222:11,15	39:13 45:14	245:2	scrupulously
247:12 250:7	50:10,13 55:17	school 14:4	243:9
ruling 19:7	69:15,17 76:14	science 15:18	scrutiny 103:2,3
		51:23 80:17	

[se - sense]

Page 56

se 31:17 205:22	52:14 61:12,18	41:16 45:14	selecting 121:4
seal 270:11	61:20,23 62:23	48:6 49:24	129:16
sean 5:19,21	66:12 67:5,7,9	50:17 51:6,6	selection 82:3,10
13:13 31:8	68:5,17,19,22	55:4 57:22 59:9	90:4
99:19 196:13,16	69:19 76:1,17,20	68:22 69:14,21	selections 80:11
197:18 214:21	76:24 77:3	70:16 75:3 78:7	90:3 91:3,15
search 110:10	109:20 111:5,18	78:16,25 80:10	selective 35:8
season 10:6	112:9,21 113:10	81:16 82:2 90:3	133:3 191:20
second 9:2,22	113:21 114:7	90:21 91:4,15,20	192:7,11,24
22:10,13 40:23	118:4,7 120:23	94:1 105:9	self 45:4 192:20
41:4,8,14 42:4	124:2,4,5,5,20	119:8 133:15	semester 254:14
43:14 44:8	124:23 136:7	135:8 136:4	semesters
47:23 54:3	146:6 148:20	145:21 150:17	252:17
63:21 104:23	149:7,7,9,22	154:17 156:7,14	senate 1:10,11
116:15,16 137:2	158:21 160:22	164:20 169:17	5:12 6:7 9:15
137:7,8,10,19,22	163:15 167:7,16	171:8 172:6	10:25 23:20
138:13 139:1,12	180:22,23 181:4	173:21 190:2	25:13 30:10
141:16 143:19	182:18 184:2,5	192:14 193:13	40:16 41:3,6
143:25 144:4,8	190:20 191:7	196:9,14 197:23	48:5,18 49:11,14
144:12,18,19,22	193:12,14,16,19	197:24 201:13	49:23 50:1 57:9
144:24 146:22	193:25 194:1,6	204:12 210:4	57:10 58:5
148:8 160:21,25	198:14,20	216:20 226:19	60:25 75:23
161:3,7 165:16	201:23 203:16	235:23 241:23	79:10 163:10
166:15 167:8,13	205:22 212:19	254:6 258:12	183:17 203:12
172:7 175:2,11	212:25 213:14	261:11,23 264:3	203:14 204:14
175:14,25	217:7 234:25	268:20	206:20 220:16
190:19 195:13	260:14 261:15	seeing 170:21	220:21 259:8
198:15,18	sections 42:14	seeks 137:14	261:8,21 266:15
203:19 205:9,24	77:11 211:3	seen 11:12 13:13	senate's 258:18
211:1,9 212:6	231:8	13:14 35:19	senior 15:7
217:10 234:4	secure 179:11	48:17 153:16	sense 7:12 22:5
258:25 259:2	180:18 181:15	154:4 157:19	32:5,23 70:10
260:5 262:10	183:5	163:16 168:12	71:23 89:14
section 30:6 34:1	securing 182:9	179:10 183:17	96:8 163:14
34:2 40:14 42:8	see 11:4,8,9 12:6	205:5 224:16	205:2 221:13
42:17,18,21 43:7	13:18 19:9 26:9	select 129:9	222:13 236:14
43:23 49:8,15	26:10 28:11	selected 127:21	236:20 250:16
51:7,9,9,12	29:11 36:3	132:5	265:12

[sent - simply]

Page 57

sent 271:14	september	shapefile 30:23	shows 46:9,11
sentence 43:7,13	238:12,13 254:2	66:18,25,25	77:21 86:15
58:3 106:9	254:23	shapefiles 66:24	94:20 142:16
131:21 132:9	sequences 129:3	shapes 61:13	159:16 171:7,12
133:24 134:15	serially 77:12	shards 77:25	177:3,3,22
136:11 137:21	seriously 84:9	78:9	shutdown
155:19,25 158:8	85:6 88:1	share 11:6,7,9	254:13
158:9 176:12	session 9:3	36:5 37:6 39:18	shy 61:3 211:11
177:2 179:7	sessions 8:15,19	51:5 76:4 119:2	side 78:24 206:1
180:10 182:5,10	set 13:1 41:8	143:3 197:23	227:25 228:4
184:5,11 185:13	48:16 136:21	shared 90:7	252:8
186:12,12	146:23 147:13	sharp 255:11	sides 188:6
187:14,16 188:4	148:4,17 170:9	sheet 271:11	227:14
189:7,10,17,23	175:18,25,25	shift 120:22	sign 271:12
190:20 198:18	176:23 193:23	191:17	signature 270:15
203:19 205:9	203:13 219:1	shifted 241:25	signed 252:5
206:16,17	235:10 239:4	shifting 205:15	271:20
210:10,12	242:13	206:6	significant 73:23
213:17 214:3	sets 49:9,12	shifts 193:24	82:13 160:1
215:22,23,25	95:19 122:19	short 50:24	162:16,18,21,24
216:1,9 218:9	188:1 212:22	shortage 83:21	163:1,2,18 164:5
246:4 259:18	260:24	84:12	177:22 223:19
262:5,11	setting 126:18	shorthand 33:9	237:5 244:2
sentiment	136:11 139:2	161:11 187:1	248:16
186:24	242:15 243:7	270:3,17	signing 269:20
separable 243:3	seven 55:22	shortly 145:23	similar 38:2,10
separate 29:20	137:7 147:19	show 38:22 77:8	40:6 115:21
43:23 48:3,12,20	171:17,19,22	78:19 86:7	118:25 119:8
48:23 67:2	172:9 175:4	111:15 133:9	131:11 155:9
169:24 226:14	seventy 251:21	137:21 139:3	similarly 1:6
227:9 258:19	255:4	154:1 155:5	simple 84:15
268:13	shaded 36:1	159:15 195:22	85:15 243:11
separated	139:9 140:3	200:22	245:7
106:24	141:10	showing 36:24	simpler 240:22
separately 48:14	shading 36:2	95:3 148:1	simply 71:3
117:14	shape 61:3 66:10	shown 132:15	134:13 202:25
separation	107:13,16,17	136:24 141:23	212:18,21,24
227:19	225:14	149:24 198:19	221:2 249:14

simultaneously 95:5 97:1 sincere 179:17 sincerely 85:5 single 19:11 48:3 156:20 202:6 238:16 singular 229:18 sit 32:25 33:16 37:24 38:24 39:9,22 40:2 93:13,17 107:1 110:22 251:14 sitting 225:16 246:6 247:21 situated 1:6 situational 205:5 six 10:9 15:20 55:22 56:11,11 177:21 248:1 sixty 254:25 skepticism 73:23 skewed 194:15 194:15,21 skipped 177:11 slash 64:2 slight 48:4 slightly 72:19 88:7 145:7 206:20 slip 186:4 slit 90:13 sloan 226:2 253:24 slog 7:22 slowly 215:16 small 78:6,11 86:22 127:1	189:1 252:3 smith 1:11 smuggle 71:22 snapshot 218:16 social 15:23 18:21 252:15 society 15:19 soften 91:24 software 27:23 51:15,20 52:6,12 52:13 223:22 224:1,3,9,12 265:3 sole 255:15 solomon 230:11 253:5 solutions 271:23 somebody 52:7 215:24 234:19 somewhat 43:5 sorry 28:5 81:1 81:12,18 82:6 85:17 92:4 94:14 95:6 102:3 116:25 124:5 130:13 141:12 156:4 158:6 161:5,10 165:21 166:4,4 187:15 205:21 210:9 230:19 241:8,9 260:1 261:20 sort 68:18 203:3 224:15 225:12 231:24 255:11 sound 7:1 50:25 92:4 219:3	227:18 233:7 238:13 241:21 254:25 sounds 29:9 31:25 32:16 51:1 59:2 89:10 233:8,13 242:2 source 52:10,13 219:10 223:22 223:25 238:16 248:4,7,10 sources 40:19 south 1:1,3,16 1:18 3:3 4:4,5 4:12 5:13 6:10 10:12 13:1 16:11,12,14 17:20 26:14 29:20,21 30:1 31:14 36:7 42:22,23 44:11 46:17 47:1 54:13 60:12 71:17 72:10,14 73:9,17 78:23 81:2 82:12 88:12,22 91:18 94:23 100:14 116:4 120:6 123:9 126:24 131:13 135:18 136:2 150:9 152:6 163:6,21 164:6 170:6 172:17 184:6 204:10 217:21 218:1 219:7,14 219:16,18 222:8	222:11,15 262:15 263:25 265:19 266:18 270:4,12 271:4 272:1 273:1 space 225:15,19 span 253:9 spanning 129:7 129:7,9 130:8,10 130:13 speak 10:10 33:9 240:20 speaker 1:12 speaking 75:17 111:23 114:9 215:15 221:9 260:18 special 19:12,13 103:17,20,21 229:5 specialties 15:12 specific 18:14 21:24 84:20 85:13,17 109:4 119:24 128:25 138:9 141:1 192:7 211:12 216:8 222:14 234:23 238:13 244:16 specifically 13:4 29:23 42:8 52:4 71:17 84:11 95:8 137:14 210:21 222:11 234:17 245:25 specificity 123:24,25
--	--	---	--

specifics 75:15	131:14,19	start 16:1 71:7	270:3 271:4
specifies 60:6	135:19 181:1,1,2	102:21 103:2	272:1 273:1
specify 140:21	181:2 191:21	143:17 198:16	state's 28:16
specifying 219:4	192:10,23 193:1	219:11 252:22	35:7 40:19,20
spectrum 188:24	193:24 194:6,7	started 13:3 15:3	140:8 176:15
speculating	200:12,19,19	64:10 166:5	177:18 179:7,13
239:8	202:22 217:11	252:24	183:23 184:7
spell 6:14 246:7	220:17	starting 51:9	190:22 202:6
spend 26:24	splitting 89:25	177:2	statement 32:21
spent 31:7,10	90:25 92:19	starts 172:8	137:24 138:1,2
191:5 254:8	93:9,23 95:14	177:2 205:10,25	155:24 156:10
spike 177:22	106:11 108:10	214:4	157:7 179:25
spirit 86:11	110:25 192:7	state 1:3,16,18	180:2,4,5,12
185:18,19 189:8	220:8	3:3 10:7 18:4	200:5 213:20
189:17 207:1	spot 138:20	19:10 22:9	216:6,10
split 25:25 48:19	spring 252:17	23:20,20 25:13	statements 32:22
53:14 64:7	254:15	25:15 28:15	69:25 74:17
79:12,16,19	spurs 64:14,18	42:23 43:2,10,17	states 1:1 6:9
89:20 90:19	square 157:7	43:19,23 44:1	24:23 71:20
93:4,10,18,20,21	staff 44:13	47:9 51:15	72:21 73:1,6
93:24 94:12	223:12,16	57:11 58:10	86:2 213:6
98:8 105:24	224:19,22 225:2	63:8 66:7 74:7	218:10,23
106:3,4 107:2,6	staffer 47:21	80:13,16,17 81:2	219:15,17
109:20,23	stakeholders	86:18 87:3,15,21	262:14
110:16 111:3	214:19	87:24 99:14,20	statewide 31:1
113:3 132:8	stand 168:1	100:8 106:4	86:9 136:7,8,14
135:21 181:5,6	standard 53:1	133:2 163:10,13	136:16 137:6
200:5 202:23	111:8 113:19	163:17,23,24	139:24 143:21
217:19 218:6,24	120:5,13 124:1	167:20 168:11	144:1,11,14
219:3,24	125:25 126:21	168:14 177:7,9	147:18 151:5,12
splits 63:16,17	131:21 136:11	178:6 179:3	153:19 171:20
63:20,22 64:3,3	138:14,21 139:4	184:9 185:1	172:16 175:13
64:17,23 65:4	140:15 141:2,5	188:17 190:17	175:15 267:5
67:23,24 68:1	212:18 244:6	202:15 218:14	statistical 60:22
79:5,21 92:15	245:3,5 269:9	218:14 219:13	264:25 265:8,13
98:13 108:14,21	standards	230:12 248:10	statistically
108:22 109:11	157:19 186:8	249:12 262:15	85:23 86:8
109:13,16	244:8	262:16 268:10	

[statistics - support]

Page 60

statistics 67:20 67:21,24 68:1,3 86:12 137:1 142:10 status 221:9 stay 130:23 stayed 22:16 stick 58:8 stipulate 33:8,11 212:10 stipulating 141:22 stipulations 74:22 stood 65:25 straight 182:6 strange 218:14 strategies 112:6 268:9,10 strategy 268:15 stream 223:13 street 3:6,20 4:4 4:11 110:10 strength 181:16 182:10 184:16 186:7 211:8 212:5,8 213:4 261:15 262:13 263:10 269:5,10 strengthened 155:20 156:1,4 strengths 97:10 stretch 110:24 strickland 120:20 strictly 209:20 strike 97:17,23	strikes 87:24 97:7 stringent 98:11 strong 97:4,7,13 99:12 157:5 168:22 185:7 187:2,4 189:11 219:18 stronger 134:22 strongly 70:7 153:21 structure 234:2 sts 18:20 student 14:18 223:14 256:22 studied 15:16 studies 14:7,15 14:16,21 135:15 154:3 studiously 32:11 study 14:17 134:23 167:22 232:8 subcategory 113:9 subcommittee 1:15 subdivision 63:17,17,20 181:2 200:12 subdivisions 62:1,20 63:2,7 63:13 180:24 subject 23:16 24:13 74:13 147:14 176:22 submerge 179:10 180:21	183:4 submerged 180:17 submission 17:7 17:11 submit 99:24 197:12 240:9,11 267:10 submitted 16:15 17:2 22:23 23:3 30:12 197:8 226:25 234:21 240:12 263:17 subordinated 33:21 subpoena 11:18 13:17,20,24 subscribed 273:14 subset 81:10 substantial 31:8 223:22 228:25 substantially 38:22 62:11 72:3 115:12 155:9 200:12 subtle 49:17 225:20 subtly 134:8 succinct 188:5 189:6 suffer 188:21 suffice 20:22 sufficient 168:20 suggest 136:9 suggestion 121:17	suite 4:5,11 sukovich 65:1 summaries 28:22 29:2 summarize 42:16 47:12 54:7 80:2 87:1 166:18 168:18 259:5 summarized 229:14 summary 76:1 194:3 198:15 summer 224:25 232:25 241:23 241:24 247:9 251:22 summerville 106:1 sumter 79:7 88:25 109:8,17 109:20 superior 202:14 202:21 superlative 95:5 96:18 supervise 247:2 supervision 27:11 28:1 supplement 91:16 supplemental 234:1 supplementary 126:5 support 20:14 23:10 27:16,19 27:20 28:8 33:4
--	--	---	--

[support - talked]

Page 61

33:10,12 81:5	supposed 167:4	surprised 235:23	tactics 113:9
84:13 90:13	supreme 19:11	267:7	taiwan 1:5 271:4
114:23 116:11	22:16 24:5	surprising	272:1 273:1
116:13 137:23	25:15 42:23	110:18 175:16	take 6:22 7:23
155:23,24 156:6	213:6	survey 36:22	8:19 9:3 10:3
156:11 157:11	sure 6:16 9:24	37:19 88:18	50:16,20,23
157:17 158:5	10:4,10 14:5,22	suspect 11:15	53:24 54:11
159:17,18 162:9	17:7 19:23 20:2	37:25 65:17	55:2 57:10
163:19,22 164:3	23:2,3 24:11	103:16 199:13	64:24 85:18
164:6 167:23,24	29:11 31:16	199:25 204:18	88:1,6 95:2
169:16 180:11	34:14 35:1,13	swaps 127:1	104:22 110:20
180:11 183:1	37:16 49:12	sworn 6:2	117:13 120:6
185:19 225:21	69:23 72:16	273:14	135:7 148:21
228:1,4,15,22	75:11 77:4 78:2	synthesize 80:2	152:23 153:6
234:7 235:18,21	79:1 81:13,25	80:16,19	169:3 177:12
238:22 239:20	84:17 85:11	synthesized	178:16 187:1
243:15 248:11	86:10 95:6	229:13	222:1 244:19
253:17,18	110:19 112:13	system 244:10	265:13 267:24
supported 89:25	124:10 125:21	244:14,20 245:4	taken 2:3 19:10
90:25 93:9,23	126:16 133:1	246:11	19:15 85:6 95:8
155:25 185:23	137:25 138:19	systematic 193:8	118:20 164:15
188:5 236:15	143:15 145:20	194:16	169:1 206:18
237:19 254:9	156:21 157:14	systems 15:16	243:21
supporter 232:1	157:15 164:23	t	takes 70:18
supporters	176:9,11 177:10	t 5:10 91:19,24	123:21 229:5
156:8	180:22 181:17	272:3,3	talk 44:2,3,15
supporting	183:6 186:19	table 53:24 54:3	57:17 67:2
107:6,19 108:21	187:17 200:22	54:4,4,4,5 55:3,5	78:10 101:13
108:22 109:11	204:5 208:21	55:9,13 56:15	105:6 106:1
109:13 111:3	217:17 220:12	63:13,25 145:22	131:24 179:20
158:10 194:25	227:24 231:7	145:22 150:12	193:19 194:6
supports 32:12	233:20 238:15	151:17,24 152:1	204:18 220:4
83:12 156:10	239:11 240:5	152:17 154:5	227:3,20 230:14
162:6	242:14,17 243:7	155:2,4 158:13	247:4 253:15
suppose 69:24	243:11 246:4	159:15 161:13	talked 91:8
150:4 175:16	247:6,11 250:18	164:19 167:12	122:2 149:22
183:3 208:4	252:6,14 254:14	171:6,10	198:24 211:21
	258:3,16 259:19		232:18 235:12

[talked - theoretically]

Page 62

243:5 259:1 talking 57:16 78:11 82:8 155:3,7 198:25 217:11 219:5 230:6,17 233:3 243:4 251:25 252:2 256:13 263:19 tallest 141:20 target 114:20 168:19 218:10 218:20,20 targeting 168:7 168:22 tautological 47:7 tax 247:14,18 248:16,24,25 249:6,10 255:21 255:25 teaching 236:17 236:21 252:14 252:18,25 254:12,14 team 25:8 technical 51:20 technically 23:2 102:19 techniques 27:23 technology 15:19 tell 6:19 14:19 14:22 17:17 39:11 43:25 45:7,8 54:23 78:1 81:22 85:4 105:14 106:17 106:19 111:21	122:9 128:18,24 156:8 167:16 179:18 180:20 189:24 193:2 196:5,7 208:10 208:22 216:22 230:3 234:22 243:12 245:25 246:5,12 telling 122:12,15 131:16 tells 167:19 ten 16:6 55:22 78:5 141:25 172:17,25 179:8 179:14 180:16 189:21 190:4 218:15 222:20 tend 130:22 137:21 153:21 172:17 177:4 178:3,18 182:13 183:25 201:1 tension 191:3 tenure 15:3 223:13 term 56:21 57:19 60:18 112:10 113:6,8 115:15 121:6,7 140:17,18 151:10 161:18 170:1 174:25 192:11,25 204:25 terminology 115:11,12,21,21	terms 23:14 26:4 27:6 86:23 122:6 170:9 203:24 terrain 77:8,21 191:15 194:12 194:20 terrific 23:9 testified 6:2 17:24 18:3,4,7 19:2 89:3 94:2 229:17 263:6 testify 86:8 246:20 testimony 6:23 17:18 18:12,24 19:2,7,11,14 21:22,23 23:17 24:13 28:10,13 28:15,22 29:3 30:13 31:13,16 46:2 79:7 80:1 80:12,14,15,22 80:23 81:8,15,22 82:4,12,16,19,23 83:15,17 85:22 85:25 86:1,5 87:2,10,17,19 88:10,20 89:5,8 89:24 90:3,11,25 91:3,7,14 92:3,7 92:16,23 93:9,12 93:14,19,23 94:5 94:7,8 95:2,9,21 95:24 96:9 107:6,19 108:21 109:11 111:3 132:12,24 149:3	183:15,24 192:1 192:6,15,21 193:17 195:19 226:22 228:15 228:20 229:5,8 229:12,16 256:15 262:19 265:18,25 266:2 266:6,17 271:9 271:18 273:8 texas 17:20 18:8 85:8 253:22 text 70:11 259:15 thank 8:4 14:1 16:10 19:16 21:15 22:4 31:12,22 59:2,4 59:20,21 61:25 62:13,19 74:24 75:19,20 81:16 84:24 104:11 115:19 116:15 142:14 149:21 152:25,25 157:25 158:12 164:11 169:2 174:10 188:7 196:11 198:10 198:10 206:2 222:16 250:23 thanks 120:19 themes 82:19 87:11 theoretical 231:1 236:14 theoretically 118:1 156:21
---	--	--	---

[theory - time]

Page 63

theory 15:17,23 252:18	89:3 91:11 93:15 94:24	189:10 190:13 192:2 193:2,12	thornburg 261:17
thereabouts 241:20	97:9 99:12 100:8,16 101:8,9	194:2 195:2 196:10 197:10	thorough 132:24
thereof 270:9	102:18,19,20 103:17,19 104:8	199:3 200:20,22 203:2,4 204:13	thoroughly 227:18
thing 7:24 39:2 62:14 65:25	105:23 107:12 108:4,24 113:2,6	205:6 206:25 207:12,22 208:6	thought 13:19 37:25 74:3 95:8
94:7,8 119:10 130:11 131:1	113:7 115:24 116:2,5,23 118:8	208:8,9 209:1,18 210:2,9 211:2,13	195:9 250:25
147:11 174:21 236:19 255:9	118:10,13 120:2 120:16 121:11	211:14 212:9,12 214:4 215:8	thousands 177:24
things 11:23 12:21,22 13:8	121:13 122:11 122:25 123:1,6	217:10,23 219:20 220:6,13	three 19:14 23:18,23 54:2,23
67:2 68:19,20 103:15 135:10	123:24 124:16 125:20 128:11	221:3,22,25 222:4 225:1	55:15,21 56:10 58:19 59:5 61:9
160:11,14 177:12 183:20	130:5 131:2 134:5,7,23 135:7	229:5 233:12,12 234:20 237:24	62:5 76:14 82:2 106:4,6 128:9
208:19 209:13 209:19,22	136:2,25 137:20 138:14,20	238:20 241:4 243:18,20 244:2	154:22 253:3 264:4
213:12 226:20 243:7 253:13	139:20 140:18 140:23 141:24	244:13,17,25 245:1,1 249:5,18	threshold 54:20 214:6
think 17:4 18:16 18:18 20:25	142:1 145:6,6,10 145:15,16,18	250:1,15 251:15 251:20 253:16	ticket 118:24 152:14
23:9 27:5 29:19 32:3,10 34:4,14	146:5,19,20,20 146:22 150:5	253:20 254:11 256:9,22 258:4,4	tickets 152:17
35:1 44:25 46:23 47:7,23	156:15,16 161:20,23 162:6	259:24 260:8 261:2 263:11,19	tie 139:23
50:7 52:10 56:22 57:24	167:19,24 169:15,24 170:4	265:15 267:4 thinking 23:1	tier 40:23,23 42:6,16 43:2,14
60:8 61:15 67:21 68:10	170:10 172:15 173:16 175:21	25:18 153:18 253:8	44:7,8,15 47:23 210:20 211:1,9
71:24 72:3,19,20 74:19 75:13	179:15 180:23 182:12 184:3	third 137:20 152:23 176:12	212:6 258:25 259:2 260:5
78:22 79:18 80:10 82:6	185:8,18,20,21 185:21 187:6,8	200:4 thirty 222:19	tiers 41:4 42:5 260:18,24
83:18,25 84:3 85:3,5,16 86:11	187:11,12 188:10 189:5,9	thomas 1:9 2:3 3:11 6:7	tim 91:4 192:16 time 1:24 7:23
87:7 88:13,15			10:5 16:1 26:24 31:8,11 36:18 87:25 96:13 97:14 173:25

[time - true]

Page 64

174:2,3,19 175:6 190:20 191:5 218:4,11 223:16 223:16 224:25 227:7,8 229:3 232:17 238:24 241:15,17 255:6 255:18,19 257:9 269:12 271:19 timeframe 271:8 timeline 13:6 95:20 96:1,5,7 96:11 times 7:22 16:22 19:17,25 121:20 152:18 154:2 171:19 tired 260:1 tisch 15:8 223:9 223:10 224:23 228:8 title 198:3 titled 111:18 124:2,20 198:14 260:15 tjh 1:8 today 6:12,19 7:5,14 8:5 9:1 11:12 32:25 33:16 38:24 39:9 40:3 90:12 107:1 110:22 198:25 231:6 246:6 251:14 today's 8:13 9:10 12:2 toggle 133:13,14 133:21	told 98:18,22 248:9 tool 224:6 tools 124:24 182:16,17,18 188:24 top 17:1 36:23 56:16,22,25 57:3 57:16 90:2 91:2 91:12 127:18 139:7 171:4,4 173:11 174:16 176:13 177:17 188:20 226:3 263:20 264:6,9 topic 24:13 50:20 topology 15:13 total 37:3,8 54:19,21 55:9,11 56:20 64:2 128:2 154:23 155:16 165:3 171:9,25 263:16 265:24 totally 138:14 totals 55:13 touch 34:20 72:18 101:4 touched 168:14 town 181:1 towns 48:20 63:3 63:24 track 15:3 tract 36:24 trade 121:18 210:6,15	tradeoff 106:12 209:20,22 212:5 tradeoffs 96:24 97:5,8,18 99:8 100:5 181:8 211:22,25 trading 211:9 traditional 23:25 24:17 33:6,18 34:11,16 67:10 74:2 103:1 134:19 136:15,16 179:10,20 180:7 180:17,20 181:7 181:14,19,20 183:4 190:24 202:15 203:4,5,7 204:23,25 205:2 209:14 220:2,4,9 220:13 231:10 traditionally 220:4 trained 229:2 230:13 training 229:6 265:5 tranche 141:19 transcript 68:15 270:5 271:6,20 273:5,8 transcripts 80:5 transformations 129:4 transition 77:10 treat 48:2,22 98:12	treated 103:19 treating 45:2,3 70:24 72:14 73:16 tree 129:9,10 130:8,13,24 trees 129:7,7 130:10,22 trenches 96:23 trende 5:19,21 13:14 99:19 196:14,16 197:18 215:1,2 215:23 216:18 219:2 trende's 31:3,8 197:4,11 200:5 214:21,22 215:6 trends 164:7 trial 25:7 32:7 trick 34:23 75:20 92:18 tried 124:16 229:24 trillions 132:4 trinkley 4:10 5:4 222:2,4,6,16 trouble 102:23 true 12:21,22 21:10 60:17 63:5 96:2 98:25 99:2 153:22 169:20 170:24 175:17 195:3 198:5 200:3 201:20 206:9 245:8 270:5 273:8
--	---	---	---

[truly - understand]

Page 65

truly 102:23 188:18 truth 6:19 245:18 try 12:19 18:16 20:20 22:2,9 26:3 32:1,10 38:19 41:6 48:6 69:23 82:10 88:18 104:1 113:22 115:25 126:24 128:23 132:25 138:1 169:24 182:14 185:17 186:19 186:23 210:13 221:2 234:2,23 254:6 266:8 trying 22:5 34:24 37:14,25 45:25 46:1 50:16 56:22 74:21 75:21 78:5 80:10 82:20 83:4,18 84:21 85:5,18,20 89:12 95:12 97:21 115:19,22 118:15 122:5 136:10 174:10 175:20 180:1 183:6 186:4,4,11 186:16 188:7,23 189:5 191:8,9,11 194:10 200:20 200:25 205:21 206:21 207:10 209:3 215:14,16	229:10 259:5 263:8 268:16 tuesday 1:23 9:4 tufts 8:6 15:4,5,8 15:8,20 223:7 224:11,20 225:15,17,18 226:8 227:14 233:22 239:16 239:25 240:2,21 241:23 242:6 243:4,14 244:16 244:23 246:15 246:17 247:14 247:18 248:15 248:20,24,25 249:11,18 250:11,19 251:17 254:12 tunable 127:22 tune 127:3 264:19 tuned 127:2,6 264:21 tuning 126:9,17 126:25 127:5,21 turn 30:17 35:14 46:20 103:12 108:6 127:13 133:14,15 143:13 176:8 193:13 259:10 turned 29:18 46:14 134:1 turning 92:13 99:6 133:21 203:16	turnout 160:11 160:12,17 167:3 turns 97:25 160:14 twenty 97:2 twice 124:16 two 8:15,18,23 9:13 10:11 19:15 21:11 26:23 27:18 41:7 54:14,23 55:9,12,21,23 56:10 57:4 66:22 78:4,14 82:2 89:20,25 93:11 99:3 103:14 122:3 126:16,23 129:8 129:10 130:7 135:7 153:3 159:2 161:21 162:4 165:4 166:3 174:11 176:2 180:6 183:23 199:13 209:4 220:14 224:3 227:25 228:12 237:14 261:11 264:4,9 type 268:16 types 262:23 typically 225:11 225:13 227:1 232:17 235:20 typos 171:8	u u 6:17 91:19 u.s. 22:16 24:5 213:2 261:18 uh 70:22 106:25 ultimate 32:13 umbrella 48:15 220:7 unaware 267:16 267:23 unclear 75:14 78:21,23 uncommonly 185:10 uncomplicated 264:16 undergrad 14:18 224:20 undergraduate 14:5 223:15 underpin 153:25 understand 6:11 6:18 7:15 34:24 35:1 46:1,3 64:1 71:24 73:12 81:19 83:4 85:24 86:10,14 95:12 112:13 115:22 116:23 117:18 119:16 122:5 125:2,11 125:16 126:19 128:1 131:24 132:25 136:23 139:8 140:9 146:1,25 150:10 156:17 167:21 170:1 176:9
--	--	---	---

181:18 182:12 184:12 186:11 186:16 188:8 191:9,9,11 207:10 209:3 210:5 236:2 237:10 245:4 252:6 256:25 257:21 260:5 understanding 13:20 24:8 86:13 95:22,25 101:24 103:7 112:16 138:15 150:1,19 151:16 170:7,12 184:4 193:2 244:8,20 246:10 255:23 255:25 256:2 257:24 understood 7:19 146:6 243:1 244:17 undertaken 182:8 undertook 83:13 unfortunately 108:17 unified 74:15 75:6 uniformly 130:10 union 3:18,19 174:8 unit 46:13 united 1:1 6:9 213:6 262:14	universal 141:4 universe 86:25 universities 243:6 university 8:6 14:6,8,16,25,25 15:4 223:8 226:4,11,13,15 227:9,13,15,17 240:3 242:4,14 242:16,17 243:5 244:5 245:13,25 246:12,22 256:23 unnamed 70:7 unpack 115:20 161:5 unpacking 191:5 unpaid 225:11 unquestionably 65:19 unquote 153:1 unusual 137:22 unusually 139:3 update 196:5,8 upheld 189:9 upload 197:22 use 12:17 34:21 35:20 36:9 39:17 44:19,23 45:7,11,13,23 46:7,14 51:21,22 51:25 52:1,12,25 53:6,21 58:19 59:13,23 60:3,9 60:18 61:9 71:10,13 83:15 83:17 98:7,9	110:11 112:10 113:6 115:11,15 118:16 121:7 126:1,17 128:9 129:6 130:17 133:25 134:4 135:1 161:20 168:3 175:1 185:4 188:23 192:11,24 193:22 218:19 223:22,23 226:9 231:7 246:22 259:2 261:5 262:25 usual 126:21 240:22 usually 48:12 97:20 151:10 153:25 uttered 246:5 v v 120:20 230:21 271:4 272:1 273:1 vacuum 169:1 vague 204:25 valance 204:1 valence 204:1,2 value 142:11 151:1 variety 124:14 various 13:6 19:17,24 20:8,12 20:21 21:9 22:19 33:12,15 49:16 54:8	66:13 74:21 75:16 81:20 91:17 97:7,18 99:13,17,21 184:6 216:11 218:22 253:23 255:19 263:12 vary 160:17 verbal 6:24,24 verified 95:25 verify 41:8 271:9 verifying 264:18 veritext 271:14 271:23 veritext.com. 271:15 version 38:15 versus 63:21 103:21 218:9 261:17 vetted 213:10 videoconference 1:22 2:5 3:9,16 3:23 4:7,13,16 5:12 11:1 view 66:6 69:8 71:9 97:22 115:5,5 123:15 127:9 139:5 185:14 195:1 views 86:17,17 86:24 87:3,6,20 88:11,19 267:9 vii 70:20 viii 49:8 violate 185:14 violates 213:14
--	--	--	---

[violation - way]

Page 67

violation 185:2	86:24 87:3,6,15	209:5,6,9,16	101:13 116:16
virtual 47:20	87:21 114:9,24	210:8,15 211:7,8	117:17 118:16
virtually 63:20	114:25 115:9	212:5,8,20,22	126:12,13 134:5
99:3 155:11	116:4,10,12,22	213:3,4 221:19	143:17 147:10
223:1	137:15 143:8	223:24 232:25	147:11 149:6
vis 249:1,1	146:2,3 154:2	252:18 261:14	155:18 159:10
visible 46:8,15	155:21 157:3,4	261:16,24 262:9	164:9 176:9
46:23 140:14,23	157:17,23,24	262:13,21 263:9	184:4 188:22
221:14	160:6,7 164:25	269:10	198:11 204:14
visits 15:1	169:11,13,16,22	vs 1:8	213:16 214:24
visualization	170:6,10 177:5	vtd 36:6 67:23	217:17 222:1,19
36:1	178:3 189:14,20	67:24 68:1	223:5 227:20
visually 94:24	205:7 264:1	135:19 200:19	wanted 99:10
vitae 5:18	268:3,14,20	202:22,23	wants 52:7
195:24	votes 138:12	217:11,22,24	117:11
voice 177:24	152:21,23 157:3	219:8 220:16	washington 3:14
voluminous	157:4 160:5,8	vt 48:20	230:12
92:23 183:15	176:2,3,4,7	135:21,21	watched 197:22
vote 111:7,19,22	178:13,13,25	191:21 217:19	way 11:19 28:25
112:4,7,11,15,23	181:15	217:25 218:6,9	32:14 39:8 44:2
112:24 113:1,4,5	voting 15:22	218:15,19,24	44:3 45:23,24
113:11,19,20	18:21 21:13	219:3,5,22 220:1	47:11 48:5,18
116:20 118:4	36:5 37:7,9	220:8,20	55:8 65:13
119:2 122:3	39:14,15,18	w	73:10,24 82:20
124:2,7,11,12,14	46:12 50:14	w 4:10	84:3 85:12,19
124:18,19	101:1 111:10	wait 241:8	87:17 88:9
138:18 153:3	113:18 114:21	waive 269:20	92:17 106:14
154:20 156:20	115:3 116:7,9,10	walk 19:25	110:23 111:13
158:16 163:10	120:9 123:3,7	35:11	112:2 114:2,10
167:7,17 175:14	150:4,14,15,21	wallace 1:14	120:2 122:3
268:19 269:5	150:24 157:8	walterboro 94:2	129:13 131:8,16
voted 169:22	160:1,13 162:12	want 14:23	133:6,15 135:6
170:5,10,14,19	162:17 166:24	20:24 22:2 26:3	138:5,22 140:19
170:20	167:3,22 172:12	35:14 40:8 58:5	146:25 151:18
voter 170:14,20	174:15 181:16	60:16 67:5 69:9	155:22 156:6,17
170:25 171:2	182:10 184:15	75:15 81:19	158:4 163:10
voters 34:3,5,19	190:6 193:5	86:14 95:6	164:21 170:17
57:8 58:14	207:15 208:1,18		182:17 186:1

205:4 206:4	160:5 162:11,17	withhold 250:18	83:21 117:15
208:22 211:21	163:6 169:16	witness 17:14	150:2 224:20
212:11,11,17	170:6,10,14	50:23 51:1	225:3,5,9,11
219:12 225:14	whittenburg	103:6 104:24	227:13,15 228:7
233:22 236:23	118:23	163:4 185:17	228:10,13,19
242:10 266:19	wholesale	186:3 221:24	230:10,14,15
ways 20:21	133:10	222:3 244:25	231:16 235:10
49:13,17 53:15	wide 59:13	249:5,24 250:15	236:11,13
56:22 64:21	widely 13:10	250:23 257:12	238:21,22 239:7
91:17 183:24	52:11 77:7	266:11 270:10	239:13,16,20
193:17	widespread	271:8,10,12,19	240:17,19
weaknesses	121:23	witnesses 243:6	242:11,21,23
97:10	width 140:5	243:23,25 245:4	244:9 251:18,20
website 28:16	142:13	women 14:7	251:21 253:16
51:14 52:20	wild 64:10	57:8 58:14	254:2 255:13,14
231:23 253:2	wildly 163:11	143:7 164:24	255:19 258:8
weeds 126:14	winding 59:17	264:1	267:3
week 8:20	winner 152:24	won 119:3,7	worked 27:7,12
251:18,22,24	winning 169:23	151:19 152:18	27:13 28:23
255:4	wins 153:1,7,9	154:19 172:1	222:12 228:23
weekends	154:7,14,23	wonderful 92:7	241:16 251:9,10
227:16 238:24	155:3,13 159:3	201:2	251:11 257:25
weeks 27:7	159:12 161:21	word 35:18,20	258:3
29:19	161:22 162:3,4	79:18 174:22	working 10:14
weighing 23:14	162:10 165:4,4,5	203:25 211:11	10:15 27:10
weight 63:7	166:3 169:6,11	226:19 229:10	114:7 133:4
87:19,20 113:8	170:12 172:22	242:1	142:5 229:1
129:13 130:13	173:12,24	wording 22:12	243:23 246:25
130:21 131:4,7	174:18 175:5,8	49:12 150:17	255:4
131:10 132:7	175:24,24 176:2	219:2	works 16:15
weights 130:12	176:6 177:21	words 46:8	27:22 48:7
130:19	201:17,22	118:16 156:1	225:7 244:7,14
wells 1:16	wisconsin 17:20	181:17 216:25	244:20 247:5,5
went 23:25 27:3	18:10,12 20:15	262:24	256:25
213:24	23:6 25:10,11,16	work 10:15 13:3	workshop
west 110:5	80:24	14:9,13,16 15:18	253:20 265:6
white 114:24,25	wishes 268:20	16:18,20 24:3	workshops
115:8 116:19		29:15,21,22	253:21

[worse - à]

Page 69

worse 62:10,11 65:2 181:20,24 201:4,6	237:24 241:22 251:13 252:11 254:7
wraps 108:1	year 17:19 31:15
write 223:21 235:18	37:18 179:8 180:17 233:16
writes 215:1,2	233:19 237:1
writing 27:13,23 75:16 96:6 122:1 158:21 226:21 228:14 228:22	240:20,22 241:8 241:10 251:23 254:7,8,8,11,18 254:19
writings 186:22	years 15:20 51:17 83:23
written 16:3,10 17:17 28:15 70:10 74:14 109:3 114:18 122:4 208:22 212:10	172:17 179:8,14 180:16 189:21 190:4 218:15 232:24 236:1 241:13 245:21 248:1 253:10 254:21 256:24
wrong 68:14 158:23 166:5	yesterday 9:4
wrote 177:15 185:18 212:11 212:14,16 237:14	york 3:7,7,21,21
x	z
x 5:1,10	zero 64:18 131:6 162:3 241:2
y	zoom 78:7,24
yeah 41:12 51:19 71:18 73:2 78:22 81:18 82:10 101:6 116:2 118:15 146:6,9 156:16 170:13 174:25 176:1 200:24 204:22 220:20	à à 249:1

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 30

(e) Review By the Witness; Changes.

(1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:

(A) to review the transcript or recording; and

(B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.

(2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1, 2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS
COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.